



Adam Lid <adam.lid@lacity.org>

Comments E & E Agenda No. 2-CF 14-0998 Water Integrated Resources Plan Annual Progress Report

1 message

Joyce Dillard <dillardjoyce@yahoo.com>

Tue, Aug 19, 2014 at 4:49 PM

Reply-To: Joyce Dillard <dillardjoyce@yahoo.com>

To: Adam Lid <Adam.lid@lacity.org>, The Honorable Felipe Fuentes <councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org>

Accuracy is a problem in this report.

YOU STATE under *Go if Triggered Projects Hyperion Service Area (HSA)*:

*Population: Based on the **2008 SCAG population projections**, the need to expand would occur sometime after year 2025.*

and under *Go if-Triggered Project Updates* include *5. Design/construction of up to 12 digesters at HTP*:

***Based on 2008 projections**, expansion would occur sometime after 2025*

COMMENTS:

- SCAG population projections that should be used are from the 2010 census. The *5th Cycle*

Regional Housing Needs Assessment Final Allocation Plan, 1/1/2014-10/1/2021

was approved by the State Department of Housing and Community Development on November 26, 2012. Growth for the City of Los Angeles is projected at 95,023.

YOU STATE under *Go-Policy Directions* includes *6. Direct DWP to continue conservation efforts, including working with Building and Safety to evaluate and develop a policy that requires developers to implement individual water meters for all new apartment buildings*:

*LADWP and the **Housing Department** have established an outreach committee with apartment owners and renters organizations to identify obstacles to submetering existing properties and potential solutions. The committee has reviewed ordinances put forth by other cities, all which refer to new construction*

*Beginning January 2011, new irrigated landscapes of 5,000 square feet or more were required to have separate water meters or submeters as part of the new **2010 California Green Building Standards Code**.*

COMMENTS:

Housing Department has been changed to Housing and Community Investment Department. 2010 Green Building Standards Code has been updated in the 2013 Green Building Standards Code.

RECYCLED WATER PROJECTS seem to be executed without a *trigger* in the following:

Go if-Triggered Project Updates: 1. Upgrades at DCT WRP to Advanced Treatment (current capacity)

Status: Although this trigger has not been reached, the City has made a decision to use DCTWRP recycled water for groundwater replenishment.

and

2. Expansion of DCT WRP to 1 00 mgd with advanced treatment

Status: DCT has the ability to receive up to 80-million gallons of wastewater daily, however the average daily flow (2008 - present) is approximately 33 MGD. Due to the reduced influent flow to the plant, expansion at DCT is not necessary at this time.

Although expansion of DCTWRP to 100 mgd is not necessary at this time, the City has made a decision to use DCTWRP recycled water for groundwater replenishment. Under the proposed project, an Advanced Water Purification Facility (AWPF) would be constructed within DCTWRP

COMMENTS:

It is not clear how this decision was made over some of the other infrastructure needs. An Economic Analysis is lacking.

2013 California Plumbing Code defines RECYCLED WATER as:

Nonpotable water that meets California Department of Public Health statewide uniform criteria for disinfected tertiary recycled water. Reclaimed (recycled) water is also known as “recycled water” or “reclaimed water”.

LADWP recycled water falls into that category-not recycled water from the Bureau of Sanitation.

LA RIVER REVITALIZATION MASTER PLAN LARRMP is emphasized in this report:

Go-Policy Directions

*2. Direct Building and Safety and DWP to evaluate and develop ordinances to require installation where feasible of dual plumbing for new multi-family, commercial and industrial developments, schools and government properties in the vicinity of existing or planned recycled water distribution systems in coordination with **LA River***

Revitalization Master Plan.

Graywater use for irrigation is permitted in the City provided system installation and use is pursuant to the **2010 California Plumbing Code**

and

3. Direct Public Works and DWP to coordinate where feasible the design/construction of recycled water distribution piping (purple pipe) with other major public works projects, including street widening, and **LA River Revitalization Master Plan** project areas. Also coordinate with other agencies, including MTA and Caltrans on major transportation projects.

and

9. Direct DWP to continue conservation awareness efforts, including increasing education programs on the benefits of using climate-appropriate plants with an emphasis on California friendly plants for landscaping or landscaped areas developed in coordination with **LA River Revitalization Master Plan (LARRMP)**, and to develop a program of incentives for implementation.

and

12. (b) Direct Public Works and Department of Planning to evaluate the possibility of requiring porous pavements in all new public facilities in coordination with **LA River Revitalization Master Plan** and large developments greater than 1 acre. Program feasibility must consider site slope, soil conditions, terrain and proximity to other improvements.

and

14. Direct Public Works LASAN-WPD and BSS to evaluate and implement integration of porous pavements into the sidewalks and parkways where feasible.

For example, conduct pilot program in East Valley, taking into consideration soil conditions and Proposition O project criteria, as well as along the future **LA River Revitalization Master Plan**.

and

23. Direct the Department of Planning to consider opportunities to incorporate IRP policy decisions in the **General Plan, Community Plan, and Specific Plan** updates or revisions, and in the future **LA River Revitalization Master Plan and Opportunity Areas**.

Status: The Department of City Planning is currently developing the new **Cornfield**

Arroyo Seco Specific Plan and updating the **Warner Center Specific Plan** both of which will include new standards that support IRP policies.

The Department's new Supplemental Use District -- **the Los Angeles River Improvement Overlay** -- which is currently under development includes numerous standards and guidelines that encourage the increase of stormwater infiltration and reduced exterior water use. The Department is also currently updating 6 of its community plans which will include the following goals and policies:

COMMENTS:

LA River Revitalization Master Plan is a development plan whereas the US Army Corps of Engineers issued the *LA River Ecosystem Feasibility Study* which is a restoration plan. We question why the other communities in the City of Los Angeles are not equitably considered for this plan.

Watershed Protection should include an emphasis on the natural environment. City of Los Angeles has several watersheds, not just the LA River.

Cornfield Arroyo Seco Specific Plan has been enacted as has the *Los Angeles River Improvement Overlay LA-RIO*. *RIO* has been expanded to the river within the City of Los Angeles boundaries. *RIO* is being considered for all water bodies in the City.

Graywater is defined in the 2013 California Plumbing Code and should be updated from the 2010 California Plumbing Code:

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 17922.12, "graywater" means untreated wastewater that has not been contaminated by any toilet discharge, has not been affected by infectious, contaminated, or unhealthy bodily wastes, and does not present a threat from contamination by unhealthy bodily wastes, and does not present a threat from contamination by unhealthful processing, manufacturing, or operating wastes. "Graywater" includes, but is not limited, to wastewater from bathtubs, showers, bathroom washbasins, clothes washing machines, and laundry tubs, but does not include wastewater from kitchen sinks and or dishwashers

RETROFITS are mentioned in *Go-Policy Directions 17. Direct Public Works, General Services, and Recreation and Parks* to identify sites that can provide onsite percolation of wet weather runoff in surplus properties, vacant lots, parks/open space, abandoned alleys in East Valley and along the LA River in the East Valley where feasible:

Status: The **Elmer Avenue Paseo Project** represents the second phase of the Elmer Avenue Neighborhood Retrofit Project located at the southern end of the Elmer Avenue project. The total project budget is \$675,806 with \$129,000 of the funding coming from the City's Prop O bond measure.

The project is a demonstration project that serves as a template for future neighborhood retrofits throughout the L.A. region.

COMMENTS:

Oros Street is also a demonstration project. Not addressed is the long-term cooperation of the neighborhood to sustain the project, as is the Oros Street case. Not mentioned is how Proposition O funding achieved any measurable results.

STORMWATER CAPTURE is described in *Go-Policy Directions 19. Direct Public Works LASAN-WPD and BSS to include all feasible BMPs in the construction or reconstruction of highway medians under its jurisdiction:*

*Additionally, the **Woodman Avenue Multi-Beneficial Stormwater Capture and Median Retrofit Project** will enhance the aesthetics of the 3,500 foot long asphalt median bordering the west side of Woodman Avenue from Lanark Street to Saticoy Street.*

The project proposes to install 99 new street trees and approximately 27,000 square feet of native and drought tolerant landscape, a five foot wide walking path, access ramps, and to provide improvements to the existing bus stops along the medians.

*Additionally, the project will reclaim the urban forest, provide pedestrian improvements and passive recreation while helping to recharge the groundwater basin, improve water quality, and alleviate local flooding. The new design will allow for the capture of surface runoff that currently flows into the **Los Angeles River and eventually into the ocean.***

*The runoff will now be directed through pre-treatment devices and into a naturalized vegetated swale for infiltration. The project also includes an educational stakeholder component in order to promote environmental stewardship. This project is a collaboration between the **City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, L.A. Sanitation, Bureau of Street Services,***

***The River Project**, with the support of the Office of Councilman Tony Cardenas, the Panorama City Neighborhood Council, local organization, and area residents. The project construction is scheduled to be completed by early 2014.*

COMMENTS:

This project was funded by the **Coastal Commission** under the name *Los Angeles Rainwater Harvesting Project* to *The River Project*.

Coastal Commission report states:

Finally, the project will provide standard plans for inclusion in an updated version of the City's Rainwater Harvesting Manual and as the City's Green Residence Standards to be adopted and incorporated into the City's "Green Streets Initiative" program. When completed the Green Residential Standard Plans can be replicated in the Los Angeles River watershed and communities elsewhere in the City of Los Angeles.

Coastal Commission funds the project:

This project would be undertaken pursuant to Chapter 5. of the Conservancy's enabling legislation, Division 21 of the Public Resources Code, regarding integrated coastal and marine resources protection. Section 31220(a) authorizes the Conservancy to undertake and award grants for projects that meet one or more criteria of Section 31220(b). Consistent with Section 31220(b) (7), the proposed project will help reduce the impact of population and economic pressures on coastal and marine resources. The retrofit of residential areas will help reduce storm-water run-off into the Los Angeles River and it will serve as a model for the City as a whole.

Local Coastal Programs along with the Local Coastal Development Permits are not addressed in this plan.

BALLONA CREEK is included in *Go-Policy Directions: 21. In the context of developing TMDL implementation plans, direct Public Works to consider diversion of dry weather runoff from **Ballona Creek** to constructed wetlands, wastewater system, or urban runoff plant for treatment and/or beneficial use. Coordinate with the Department of Recreation and Parks. Coordinate and evaluate the impact with the **LA River Master Plan**.*

COMMENTS:

We question if the Estuary is under consideration as to the aspects of preservation. *LA River Master Plan*, a Los Angeles County plan, should not have an effect on this water body. Watershed protection should include birds and the wildlife.

TMDL IMPLEMENTATION is an important component that is underplayed in this report *Go-Policy Directions 22. In the context of developing TMDL implementation plans, direct Public Works to consider diversion of dry weather runoff from inland creeks and storm drains that are tributary to the Los Angeles River to wastewater system or constructed wetlands or treatment/retention/infiltration basins with consideration for slope and topography:*

However, projects such Los Angeles Downtown LowFlow diversion and South Los Angeles Wetlands Park will contribute towards compliance with the bacteria TMDL.

*The South Los Angeles Wetlands Park transformed an existing rail maintenance yard into constructed wetlands with surrounding walking trails, riparian vegetation and other passive recreation elements. **The wetland is designed to capture and treat stormwater and urban runoff from a 540-acre drainage area.** The project was completed in late 2011.*

COMMENTS:

There is no treatment at the South LA Wetlands Park and water used was supplied from LADWP (David Goldstein, CBS Investigates). It is time to get honest about these projects and measure the results and the costs.

COMMENTS:

OMISSION includes various studies and code updates and definition confusion.

Please note that Regional Coastal Impacts are being studied by scientists including Hyperion and its vulnerability.

Rainwater is defined in the 2013 California Plumbing Code:

Precipitation on any public or private parcel that has not entered an offsite storm drain system or channel, a flood control channel or stream channel, and has not previously been put to beneficial use.

Stormwater (storm sewer) requires a municipal permitting process (MS4) and should not be confused with graywater or rainwater harvesting. Urban runoff is a state term, not a Federal term under the Clean Water Act.

Missing is an update of the Mitigation and Monitoring Program certified in the Final Environmental Impact Report.

Joyce Dillard
P.O. Box 31377
Los Angeles, CA 90031

Attachments
5thCyclePFinalRHNAplan
HCDApproval_scagRHNAPlan112612
20120119Board06_Rainwater_Harvesting_Project

3 attachments

 **5thCyclePFinalRHNAplan.pdf**
80K

 **HCDApproval_scagRHNAPlan112612.pdf**
492K

 **20120119Board06_Rainwater_Harvesting_Project.pdf**
199K

Southern California Association of Governments
5th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Assessment Final Allocation Plan, 1/1/2014 - 10/1/2021

Income Category Distribution*						Draft RHNA Components**				Final RHNA Allocation					
County		% very low income households	% low income households	% moderate income households	% above moderate income households	% total	Household Growth (2014-2021)	Base Vacancy Needs	Total Replacement Needs	Vacancy Credit	Number of very low income households	Number of low income households	Number of moderate income households	Number of above moderate income households	Total
Imperial		25.2%	15.8%	15.5%	43.5%	100.0%	17,428	479	49	1,404	4,194	2,553	2,546	7,258	16,551
Los Angeles		25.3%	15.6%	16.8%	42.3%	100.0%	200,572	6,131	1,268	28,297	45,672	27,469	30,043	76,697	179,881
Orange		22.9%	16.8%	18.5%	41.8%	100.0%	41,530	1,143	414	6,150	8,734	6,246	6,971	16,015	37,966
Riverside		23.7%	16.5%	18.3%	41.5%	100.0%	120,308	2,948	175	22,059	24,117	16,319	18,459	42,479	101,374
San Bernardino		23.3%	16.6%	18.4%	41.7%	100.0%	70,623	1,890	469	16,833	13,399	9,265	10,490	24,053	57,207
Ventura		23.5%	16.5%	18.6%	41.4%	100.0%	19,628	523	41	647	4,516	3,095	3,544	8,003	19,158
SCAG		24.3%	16.2%	17.6%	41.9%	100.0%	470,089	13,113	2,416	75,390	100,632	64,947	72,053	174,505	412,137
County		% very low income households	% low income households	% moderate income households	% above moderate income households	% total	Household Growth (2014-2021)	Base Vacancy Needs	Total Replacement Needs	Vacancy Credit	Number of very low income households	Number of low income households	Number of moderate income households	Number of above moderate income households	Total
Imperial	Brawley city	24.9%	15.9%	15.4%	43.8%	100%	3,080	90	4	141	760	470	466	1,338	3,034
Imperial	Calexico city	25.3%	15.5%	15.3%	43.9%	100%	3,139	91	8	13	817	489	490	1,428	3,224
Imperial	Calipatria city	25.9%	15.8%	15.5%	42.9%	100%	187	5	0	48	37	22	22	63	144
Imperial	El Centro city	25.2%	15.9%	15.5%	43.3%	100%	2,118	64	8	265	487	300	297	840	1,924
Imperial	Holtville city	25.5%	15.3%	15.4%	43.8%	100%	222	7	1	20	54	31	32	92	209
Imperial	Imperial city	26.5%	16.1%	15.5%	41.9%	100%	1,367	32	1	91	349	205	202	553	1,309
Imperial	Westmorland city	24.2%	15.5%	15.6%	44.6%	100%	230	7	3	8	57	35	36	105	233
Imperial	Unincorporated	25.1%	15.8%	15.5%	43.5%	100%	7,085	182	25	819	1,633	1,001	1,001	2,839	6,474
Los Angeles	Agoura Hills city	27.0%	16.6%	17.1%	39.4%	100%	113	2	0	0	31	19	20	45	115
Los Angeles	Alhambra city	25.4%	15.4%	16.6%	42.6%	100%	1,580	52	0	141	380	224	246	642	1,492
Los Angeles	Arcadia city	26.1%	16.2%	16.9%	40.8%	100%	1,141	30	0	117	276	167	177	434	1,054
Los Angeles	Artesia city	25.5%	15.1%	16.6%	42.8%	100%	112	3	5	0	31	18	20	51	120
Los Angeles	Avalon city	25.5%	15.0%	17.2%	42.3%	100%	149	6	3	79	20	12	14	34	80
Los Angeles	Azusa city	25.4%	15.5%	16.4%	42.7%	100%	868	25	6	120	198	118	127	336	779
Los Angeles	Baldwin Park city	25.3%	15.3%	16.2%	43.1%	100%	528	14	15	0	142	83	90	242	557
Los Angeles	Bell city	24.1%	15.2%	16.7%	44.0%	100%	40	1	6	0	11	7	8	21	47
Los Angeles	Bellflower city	25.3%	15.3%	16.5%	42.9%	100%	91	3	0	115	1	1	0	0	2
Los Angeles	Bell Gardens city	24.5%	15.0%	16.4%	44.1%	100%	33	1	12	0	11	7	8	20	46
Los Angeles	Beverly Hills city	26.0%	16.3%	17.1%	40.7%	100%	271	9	34	324	1	1	1	0	3
Los Angeles	Bradbury city	27.5%	17.1%	17.7%	37.7%	100%	7	0	1	7	1	1	0	0	2
Los Angeles	Burbank city	25.8%	15.8%	16.6%	41.9%	100%	2,767	88	62	234	694	413	443	1,134	2,684
Los Angeles	Calabasas city	26.7%	16.8%	17.5%	39.0%	100%	325	7	0	3	88	54	57	131	330
Los Angeles	Carson city	26.2%	15.9%	16.6%	41.3%	100%	1,662	36	0	0	447	263	280	708	1,698
Los Angeles	Cerritos city	26.5%	16.2%	17.0%	40.2%	100%	84	2	0	0	23	14	14	35	86
Los Angeles	Claremont city	26.2%	16.1%	17.1%	40.6%	100%	372	9	0	8	98	59	64	152	373
Los Angeles	Commerce city	25.1%	15.5%	15.9%	43.6%	100%	44	1	0	0	12	7	7	20	46
Los Angeles	Compton city	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	100%	11	0	4	302	1	1	0	0	2
Los Angeles	Covina city	26.0%	15.6%	16.6%	41.7%	100%	310	9	2	90	60	35	38	97	230
Los Angeles	Cudahy city	25.0%	14.7%	16.1%	44.2%	100%	303	12	3	0	80	46	51	141	318
Los Angeles	Culver City city	26.0%	16.0%	16.9%	41.1%	100%	180	5	0	0	48	29	31	77	185
Los Angeles	Diamond Bar city	26.8%	16.3%	16.7%	40.2%	100%	1,122	23	0	0	308	182	190	466	1,146
Los Angeles	Downey city	25.7%	15.4%	16.6%	42.2%	100%	854	25	19	84	210	123	135	346	814
Los Angeles	Duarte city	25.7%	16.0%	16.3%	42.0%	100%	329	8	0	0	87	53	55	142	337
Los Angeles	El Monte city	24.6%	15.0%	16.5%	43.8%	100%	2,069	67	34	28	529	315	352	946	2,142
Los Angeles	El Segundo city	26.5%	16.0%	17.3%	40.2%	100%	60	2	7	0	18	11	12	28	69
Los Angeles	Gardena city	24.7%	15.4%	16.6%	43.2%	100%	394	12	0	9	98	60	66	173	397
Los Angeles	Glendale city	25.1%	15.7%	16.8%	42.4%	100%	2,291	77	61	411	508	310	337	862	2,017
Los Angeles	Glendora city	26.4%	15.9%	16.8%	40.9%	100%	661	15	9	0	171	100	108	267	646
Los Angeles	Hawaiian Gardens city	24.9%	15.3%	16.4%	43.4%	100%	124	4	3	2	32	19	21	57	129

Southern California Association of Governments
5th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Assessment Final Allocation Plan, 1/1/2014 - 10/1/2021

County		% very low income households	% low income households	% moderate income households	% above moderate income households	% total	Household Growth (2014-2021)	Base Vacancy Needs	Total Replacement Needs	Vacancy Credit	Number of very low income households	Number of low income households	Number of moderate income households	Number of above moderate income households	Total
		Los Angeles	Hawthorne city	24.8%	15.2%	16.5%	43.5%	100%	711	26	0	55	170	101	112
Los Angeles	Hermosa Beach city	26.8%	16.1%	17.4%	39.7%	100%	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Los Angeles	Hidden Hills city	27.6%	17.0%	18.2%	37.2%	100%	18	0	3	2	5	3	3	7	18
Los Angeles	Huntington Park city	24.1%	14.7%	16.7%	44.5%	100%	845	31	18	0	216	128	149	402	895
Los Angeles	Industry city	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Los Angeles	Inglewood city	24.5%	15.2%	16.6%	43.7%	100%	1,159	39	75	261	250	150	167	446	1,013
Los Angeles	Irwindale city	25.9%	15.8%	16.4%	41.9%	100%	15	0	1	1	4	2	2	7	15
Los Angeles	La Canada Flintridge city	27.0%	16.5%	17.6%	38.8%	100%	110	2	0	0	30	18	20	44	112
Los Angeles	La Habra Heights city	26.8%	16.6%	17.5%	39.1%	100%	117	2	1	1	32	19	21	47	119
Los Angeles	Lakewood city	26.5%	16.0%	16.7%	40.8%	100%	425	10	0	32	107	63	67	166	403
Los Angeles	La Mirada city	26.2%	16.1%	17.0%	40.7%	100%	230	5	0	0	62	37	40	96	235
Los Angeles	Lancaster city	24.9%	15.7%	16.5%	42.9%	100%	3,980	107	33	1,610	627	384	413	1,086	2,510
Los Angeles	La Puente city	25.4%	15.1%	16.5%	43.0%	100%	942	25	0	0	208	121	135	354	818
Los Angeles	La Verne city	26.1%	16.1%	16.8%	41.0%	100%	585	13	3	39	147	88	94	233	562
Los Angeles	Lawndale city	25.0%	15.4%	16.4%	43.3%	100%	368	13	0	0	96	57	62	166	381
Los Angeles	Lomita city	25.8%	15.8%	16.8%	41.6%	100%	36	1	9	0	12	7	8	20	47
Los Angeles	Long Beach city	25.1%	15.5%	16.7%	42.8%	100%	9,487	309	0	2,748	1,773	1,066	1,170	3,039	7,048
Los Angeles	Los Angeles city	24.8%	15.5%	16.8%	42.8%	100%	95,023	3,186	0	16,207	20,427	12,435	13,728	35,412	82,002
Los Angeles	Lynwood city	24.9%	15.0%	16.5%	43.6%	100%	453	14	27	0	123	72	81	218	494
Los Angeles	Malibu city	26.4%	16.5%	17.4%	39.6%	100%	130	3	3	198	1	1	0	0	2
Los Angeles	Manhattan Beach city	26.9%	16.5%	17.5%	39.1%	100%	37	1	0	0	10	6	7	15	38
Los Angeles	Maywood city	24.3%	14.8%	16.7%	44.2%	100%	50	2	1	0	13	8	9	23	53
Los Angeles	Monrovia city	25.8%	15.9%	16.7%	41.6%	100%	388	12	14	25	101	61	65	162	389
Los Angeles	Montebello city	25.2%	15.5%	16.5%	42.8%	100%	1,031	32	3	0	269	161	175	461	1,066
Los Angeles	Monterey Park city	25.0%	15.5%	17.0%	42.5%	100%	755	21	41	2	205	123	137	350	815
Los Angeles	Norwalk city	25.8%	15.7%	16.3%	42.1%	100%	187	5	9	0	52	31	33	85	201
Los Angeles	Palmdale city	25.5%	15.5%	16.6%	42.4%	100%	6,432	158	0	1,139	1,395	827	898	2,332	5,452
Los Angeles	Palos Verdes Estates city	27.3%	16.8%	17.6%	38.3%	100%	3	0	15	2	4	3	3	6	16
Los Angeles	Paramount city	24.7%	15.2%	16.2%	43.9%	100%	151	5	0	51	26	16	17	46	105
Los Angeles	Pasadena city	25.4%	15.9%	16.9%	41.8%	100%	2,051	65	29	812	340	207	224	561	1,332
Los Angeles	Pico Rivera city	25.4%	15.8%	16.6%	42.2%	100%	829	20	0	0	217	131	140	362	850
Los Angeles	Pomona city	25.2%	15.3%	16.4%	43.0%	100%	3,862	110	0	346	919	543	592	1,572	3,626
Los Angeles	Rancho Palos Verdes city	26.9%	16.5%	17.4%	39.2%	100%	30	1	0	0	8	5	5	13	31
Los Angeles	Redondo Beach city	26.5%	16.4%	17.1%	40.0%	100%	1,293	38	121	56	372	223	238	564	1,397
Los Angeles	Rolling Hills city	27.3%	16.5%	17.8%	38.4%	100%	9	0	2	5	2	1	1	2	6
Los Angeles	Rolling Hills Estates city	27.1%	16.6%	17.9%	38.3%	100%	14	0	2	11	1	1	1	2	5
Los Angeles	Rosemead city	25.3%	15.0%	16.5%	43.2%	100%	550	17	35	0	153	88	99	262	602
Los Angeles	San Dimas city	26.1%	15.9%	16.8%	41.1%	100%	457	11	4	9	121	72	77	193	463
Los Angeles	San Fernando city	25.3%	15.3%	16.1%	43.3%	100%	221	6	5	15	55	32	35	95	217
Los Angeles	San Gabriel city	25.3%	15.6%	16.6%	42.4%	100%	958	29	0	57	236	142	154	398	930
Los Angeles	San Marino city	27.0%	16.6%	18.0%	38.4%	100%	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Los Angeles	Santa Clarita city	26.4%	16.2%	17.0%	40.3%	100%	8,338	197	2	216	2,208	1,315	1,410	3,389	8,322
Los Angeles	Santa Fe Springs city	25.2%	15.8%	16.5%	42.5%	100%	350	9	0	35	82	50	53	139	324
Los Angeles	Santa Monica city	25.5%	16.1%	17.0%	41.5%	100%	1,745	64	83	218	428	263	283	700	1,674
Los Angeles	Sierra Madre city	26.3%	16.3%	17.1%	40.3%	100%	60	2	0	7	14	9	9	23	55
Los Angeles	Signal Hill city	26.1%	16.2%	16.5%	41.2%	100%	197	6	0	34	44	27	28	70	169
Los Angeles	South El Monte city	24.8%	14.9%	16.4%	43.9%	100%	162	5	6	0	43	25	28	76	172
Los Angeles	South Gate city	24.8%	15.1%	16.3%	43.8%	100%	1,172	37	53	0	314	185	205	558	1,262
Los Angeles	South Pasadena city	26.1%	16.2%	17.0%	40.7%	100%	130	4	3	74	17	10	11	25	63
Los Angeles	Temple City city	26.2%	15.8%	16.5%	41.5%	100%	531	14	61	2	159	93	99	252	603

Southern California Association of Governments
5th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Assessment Final Allocation Plan, 1/1/2014 - 10/1/2021

County		% very low income households	% low income households	% moderate income households	% above moderate income households	% total	Household Growth (2014-2021)	Base Vacancy Needs	Total Replacement Needs	Vacancy Credit	Number of very low income households	Number of low income households	Number of moderate income households	Number of above moderate income households	Total
		Los Angeles	Torrance city	26.1%	16.0%	16.8%	41.0%	100%	1,416	40	38	43	380	227	243
Los Angeles	Vernon city	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0%	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Los Angeles	Walnut city	26.9%	16.3%	17.1%	39.6%	100%	892	17	0	0	246	144	155	363	908
Los Angeles	West Covina city	26.0%	15.8%	16.7%	41.5%	100%	806	20	5	0	217	129	138	347	831
Los Angeles	West Hollywood city	24.8%	15.7%	16.9%	42.7%	100%	408	16	0	347	19	12	13	33	77
Los Angeles	Westlake Village city	27.0%	16.3%	17.5%	39.2%	100%	44	1	0	0	12	7	8	18	45
Los Angeles	Whittier city	25.9%	15.8%	16.7%	41.6%	100%	911	25	3	60	228	135	146	369	878
Los Angeles	Unincorporated	25.6%	15.6%	16.8%	42.0%	100%	30,574	804	269	1,503	7,854	4,650	5,060	12,581	30,145
Orange	Aliso Viejo city	23.9%	17.0%	18.2%	40.9%	100%	38	1	0	0	9	7	7	16	39
Orange	Anaheim city	21.9%	16.3%	18.3%	43.5%	100%	6,877	209	0	1,385	1,256	907	1,038	2,501	5,702
Orange	Brea city	22.9%	16.9%	18.2%	42.0%	100%	1,826	47	4	26	426	305	335	785	1,851
Orange	Buena Park city	22.4%	16.1%	18.3%	43.2%	100%	349	10	7	27	76	53	62	148	339
Orange	Costa Mesa city	24.8%	24.8%	25.0%	25.4%	100%	174	6	24	312	1	1	0	0	2
Orange	Cypress city	23.1%	16.8%	18.2%	42.0%	100%	295	7	6	0	71	50	56	131	308
Orange	Dana Point city	23.0%	16.6%	18.6%	41.8%	100%	474	13	17	178	76	53	61	137	327
Orange	Fountain Valley city	23.1%	16.9%	18.2%	41.9%	100%	350	8	0	0	83	59	65	151	358
Orange	Fullerton city	22.2%	16.6%	18.4%	42.8%	100%	2,163	62	32	416	411	299	337	794	1,841
Orange	Garden Grove city	21.9%	16.4%	18.2%	43.5%	100%	715	20	12	0	164	120	135	328	747
Orange	Huntington Beach city	23.0%	16.7%	18.4%	41.9%	100%	1,478	40	11	175	313	220	248	572	1,353
Orange	Irvine city	23.1%	17.1%	18.5%	41.3%	100%	12,686	380	0	918	2,817	2,034	2,239	5,059	12,149
Orange	Laguna Beach city	24.8%	24.8%	25.0%	25.4%	100%	32	1	1	172	1	1	0	0	2
Orange	Laguna Hills city	24.8%	24.8%	25.0%	25.4%	100%	124	3	0	166	1	1	0	0	2
Orange	Laguna Niguel city	23.4%	17.1%	18.5%	41.0%	100%	158	4	21	0	43	30	34	75	182
Orange	Laguna Woods city	24.8%	24.8%	25.0%	25.4%	100%	129	3	0	443	1	1	0	0	2
Orange	La Habra city	22.4%	16.1%	18.1%	43.3%	100%	135	4	0	135	1	1	1	1	4
Orange	Lake Forest city	23.6%	16.9%	18.3%	41.2%	100%	2,663	63	0	0	647	450	497	1,133	2,727
Orange	La Palma city	23.2%	16.8%	18.3%	41.7%	100%	9	0	0	0	2	2	2	3	9
Orange	Los Alamitos city	22.6%	17.1%	17.7%	42.6%	100%	55	2	4	0	14	10	11	26	61
Orange	Mission Viejo city	23.4%	16.9%	18.5%	41.2%	100%	173	4	0	0	42	29	33	73	177
Orange	Newport Beach city	23.3%	17.2%	19.0%	40.6%	100%	533	15	0	608	1	1	1	2	5
Orange	Orange city	22.8%	16.6%	18.4%	42.2%	100%	394	11	7	49	83	59	66	155	363
Orange	Placentia city	22.6%	16.9%	18.3%	42.2%	100%	479	12	1	0	112	81	90	209	492
Orange	Rancho Santa Margarita city	23.9%	16.9%	18.4%	40.7%	100%	12	0	1	31	1	1	0	0	2
Orange	San Clemente city	23.0%	16.8%	18.7%	41.5%	100%	662	17	4	101	134	95	108	244	581
Orange	San Juan Capistrano city	22.9%	16.7%	18.9%	41.5%	100%	625	14	0	2	147	104	120	267	638
Orange	Santa Ana city	21.8%	16.1%	18.1%	44.0%	100%	503	15	25	339	45	32	37	90	204
Orange	Seal Beach city	24.8%	24.8%	25.0%	25.4%	100%	19	0	10	186	1	1	0	0	2
Orange	Stanton city	21.8%	16.1%	18.1%	44.0%	100%	329	10	2	28	68	49	56	140	313
Orange	Tustin city	22.9%	16.3%	18.3%	42.5%	100%	1,219	36	127	155	283	195	224	525	1,227
Orange	Villa Park city	24.5%	17.3%	19.2%	39.1%	100%	14	0	0	0	3	2	3	6	14
Orange	Westminster city	24.8%	24.8%	25.0%	25.4%	100%	110	3	5	297	1	1	0	0	2
Orange	Yorba Linda city	23.8%	17.3%	18.9%	40.1%	100%	633	13	24	0	160	113	126	270	669
Orange	Unincorporated	23.4%	17.1%	18.7%	40.8%	100%	5,094	111	67	0	1,240	879	979	2,174	5,272
Riverside	Banning city	23.0%	16.0%	18.2%	42.8%	100%	4,120	101	8	437	872	593	685	1,642	3,792
Riverside	Beaumont city	24.2%	16.7%	18.5%	40.6%	100%	5,415	122	2	289	1,267	854	969	2,160	5,250
Riverside	Blythe city	22.7%	16.4%	18.7%	42.2%	100%	565	17	15	194	91	64	75	172	402
Riverside	Calimesa city	23.2%	16.8%	18.6%	41.4%	100%	2,439	51	1	150	543	383	433	982	2,341
Riverside	Canyon Lake city	25.3%	17.0%	18.9%	38.7%	100%	141	3	0	61	21	14	16	32	83
Riverside	Cathedral City city	23.5%	18.4%	18.4%	41.8%	100%	1,241	32	19	693	141	95	110	254	600
Riverside	Coachella city	23.0%	16.0%	18.0%	43.0%	100%	6,871	181	1	283	1,555	1,059	1,212	2,945	6,771

Southern California Association of Governments
5th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Assessment Final Allocation Plan, 1/1/2014 - 10/1/2021

County		% very low income households	% low income households	% moderate income households	% above moderate income households	% total	Household Growth (2014-2021)	Base Vacancy Needs	Total Replacement Needs	Vacancy Credit	Number of very low income households	Number of low income households	Number of moderate income households	Number of above moderate income households	Total
Riverside	Corona city	25.0%	17.0%	18.4%	39.5%	100%	1,081	27	5	343	192	128	142	308	770
Riverside	Desert Hot Springs city	22.6%	16.1%	18.5%	42.8%	100%	4,944	151	3	903	946	661	772	1,817	4,196
Riverside	Eastvale city	25.6%	17.1%	18.7%	38.6%	100%	1,578	32	0	147	374	250	274	565	1,463
Riverside	Hemet city	22.2%	16.3%	18.6%	43.0%	100%	2,797	74	0	2,267	134	96	112	262	604
Riverside	Indian Wells city	25.3%	17.3%	19.2%	38.2%	100%	291	6	1	138	40	27	31	62	160
Riverside	Indio city	23.6%	16.5%	18.4%	41.5%	100%	4,053	103	0	1,131	714	487	553	1,271	3,025
Riverside	Jurupa Valley city	23.9%	16.1%	17.9%	42.1%	100%	1,975	49	0	313	409	275	307	721	1,712
Riverside	Lake Elsinore city	24.3%	16.7%	18.3%	40.8%	100%	5,211	131	11	424	1,196	801	897	2,035	4,929
Riverside	La Quinta city	25.0%	17.1%	18.2%	39.7%	100%	1,336	30	18	1,020	91	61	66	146	364
Riverside	Menifee city	23.9%	16.5%	18.3%	41.3%	100%	6,842	150	0	748	1,488	1,007	1,140	2,610	6,245
Riverside	Moreno Valley city	24.3%	16.5%	18.1%	41.1%	100%	7,114	182	15	1,142	1,500	993	1,112	2,564	6,169
Riverside	Murrieta city	25.1%	17.1%	18.5%	39.3%	100%	2,174	52	4	657	395	262	289	627	1,573
Riverside	Norco city	25.0%	17.0%	18.6%	39.4%	100%	809	17	4	12	205	136	151	326	818
Riverside	Palm Desert city	23.9%	16.5%	18.6%	41.0%	100%	1,960	50	0	1,596	98	67	76	172	413
Riverside	Palm Springs city	23.3%	16.3%	18.5%	42.0%	100%	2,010	55	8	1,802	63	43	50	116	272
Riverside	Perris city	24.0%	16.3%	17.8%	41.9%	100%	4,693	118	4	536	1,026	681	759	1,814	4,280
Riverside	Rancho Mirage city	24.3%	17.1%	18.6%	40.0%	100%	594	12	0	511	23	15	18	39	95
Riverside	Riverside city	24.2%	16.5%	18.2%	41.0%	100%	9,534	270	35	1,556	2,002	1,336	1,503	3,442	8,283
Riverside	San Jacinto city	23.1%	16.6%	18.2%	42.1%	100%	3,000	74	5	646	562	394	441	1,036	2,433
Riverside	Temecula city	25.2%	17.2%	18.2%	39.4%	100%	1,903	46	14	470	375	251	271	596	1,493
Riverside	Wildomar city	24.5%	16.8%	18.3%	40.4%	100%	2,620	60	1	146	621	415	461	1,038	2,535
Riverside	Unincorporated	23.8%	16.6%	18.4%	41.3%	100%	32,994	752	0	3,443	7,173	4,871	5,534	12,725	30,303
San Bernardino	Adelanto city	22.2%	16.5%	18.1%	43.1%	100%	3,276	91	8	534	633	459	513	1,236	2,841
San Bernardino	Apple Valley town	22.8%	16.6%	18.8%	41.8%	100%	4,055	98	0	819	764	541	622	1,407	3,334
San Bernardino	Barstow city	22.2%	16.8%	18.4%	42.6%	100%	1,456	44	4	662	188	138	154	363	843
San Bernardino	Big Bear Lake city	25.0%	25.0%	25.1%	24.8%	100%	188	5	11	776	1	1	0	0	2
San Bernardino	Chino city	24.3%	16.9%	18.5%	40.2%	100%	3,008	73	0	187	707	478	533	1,176	2,894
San Bernardino	Chino Hills city	25.0%	17.6%	19.1%	38.3%	100%	844	18	0	0	217	148	164	333	862
San Bernardino	Colton city	23.0%	16.1%	18.1%	42.8%	100%	2,265	67	17	425	443	302	347	831	1,923
San Bernardino	Fontana city	24.0%	16.7%	18.3%	40.9%	100%	6,385	155	0	564	1,442	974	1,090	2,471	5,977
San Bernardino	Grand Terrace city	23.6%	16.9%	18.4%	41.1%	100%	158	4	0	44	28	19	22	49	118
San Bernardino	Hesperia city	23.1%	16.4%	18.4%	42.1%	100%	2,416	60	7	768	398	274	314	729	1,715
San Bernardino	Highland city	23.2%	16.8%	18.8%	41.2%	100%	1,744	44	3	291	349	246	280	625	1,500
San Bernardino	Loma Linda city	23.1%	16.6%	18.6%	41.7%	100%	1,354	45	3	308	254	177	202	462	1,095
San Bernardino	Montclair city	23.4%	16.7%	18.0%	41.9%	100%	709	19	3	35	164	114	125	294	697
San Bernardino	Needles city	21.0%	16.6%	18.9%	43.4%	100%	359	10	3	191	38	29	34	80	181
San Bernardino	Ontario city	23.8%	16.5%	18.3%	41.5%	100%	10,921	310	22	392	2,592	1,745	1,977	4,547	10,861
San Bernardino	Rancho Cucamonga city	24.5%	17.1%	18.7%	39.8%	100%	1,002	26	9	188	209	141	158	340	848
San Bernardino	Redlands city	23.8%	16.7%	18.7%	40.8%	100%	2,765	74	8	418	579	396	453	1,001	2,429
San Bernardino	Rialto city	23.4%	16.3%	18.3%	42.0%	100%	3,304	85	0	674	636	432	496	1,151	2,715
San Bernardino	San Bernardino city	22.3%	16.3%	18.5%	43.0%	100%	6,116	183	113	2,028	980	696	808	1,900	4,384
San Bernardino	Twentynine Palms city	22.5%	16.3%	18.6%	42.6%	100%	807	28	2	384	103	72	84	195	454
San Bernardino	Upland city	24.0%	16.7%	18.6%	40.7%	100%	1,945	54	3	412	382	260	294	653	1,589
San Bernardino	Victorville city	23.0%	16.8%	18.3%	42.0%	100%	8,679	230	42	1,579	1,698	1,207	1,342	3,124	7,371
San Bernardino	Yucaipa city	23.4%	16.7%	18.7%	41.2%	100%	1,942	44	13	395	376	261	299	669	1,605
San Bernardino	Yucca Valley town	22.4%	16.4%	18.6%	42.6%	100%	1,262	33	2	366	209	149	172	400	930
San Bernardino	Unincorporated	23.0%	16.5%	18.5%	41.9%	100%	3,662	89	197	4,392	9	6	7	17	39
Ventura	Camarillo city	24.1%	16.9%	18.6%	40.4%	100%	2,229	54	0	59	539	366	411	908	2,224
Ventura	Fillmore city	23.0%	16.6%	18.5%	41.9%	100%	714	18	2	40	160	112	128	294	694
Ventura	Moorpark city	24.7%	17.3%	18.7%	39.3%	100%	1,135	25	4	0	289	197	216	462	1,164

Southern California Association of Governments
5th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Assessment Final Allocation Plan, 1/1/2014 - 10/1/2021

County		% very low income households	% low income households	% moderate income households	% above moderate income households	% total	Household Growth (2014-2021)	Base Vacancy Needs	Total Replacement Needs	Vacancy Credit	Number of very low income households	Number of low income households	Number of moderate income households	Number of above moderate income households	Total
Ventura	Ojai city	23.3%	16.3%	19.0%	41.4%	100%	382	11	0	22	87	59	70	155	371
Ventura	Oxnard city	23.0%	16.3%	18.6%	42.1%	100%	7,090	200	11	0	1,688	1,160	1,351	3,102	7,301
Ventura	Port Hueneme city	23.1%	15.9%	18.2%	42.8%	100%	162	5	0	173	1	1	0	0	2
Ventura	San Buenaventura (Ventura) cit	23.5%	16.6%	18.5%	41.5%	100%	3,706	105	6	163	861	591	673	1,529	3,654
Ventura	Santa Paula city	22.3%	16.0%	18.9%	42.8%	100%	1,261	35	2	14	288	201	241	555	1,285
Ventura	Simi Valley city	24.6%	17.0%	18.4%	40.1%	100%	1,228	28	0	0	310	208	229	509	1,256
Ventura	Thousand Oaks city	24.6%	17.1%	18.8%	39.5%	100%	188	4	0	0	47	32	36	77	192
Ventura	Unincorporated	24.2%	16.9%	18.7%	40.3%	100%	1,534	37	15	177	246	168	189	412	1,015

*Final income category distribution is based on 2005-09 ACS data, HCD's regional income category distribution, 110% social equity adjustment, and adjustments resulting from any incorporation agreements. Due to rounding, the Final RHNA Allocation may not follow the exact percentage.

**The Draft RHNA Allocation components do not total the Final RHNA Allocation due to adjustments resulting from the revision request process (La Puente and County of Ventura), and a correction made due to the inclusion of unincorporated county growth (Glendora). In some local jurisdictions, the sum of the components may not equal to the Final RHNA Allocation.

**DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF HOUSING POLICY DEVELOPMENT**

1800 Third Street, Suite 430
P. O. Box 952053Mr
Sacramento, CA 94252-2053
(916) 323-3177 / FAX (916) 327-2643
www.hcd.ca.gov



November 26, 2012

Mr. Hasan Ikhata, Executive Director
Southern California Association of Governments
818 West Seventh Street, 12th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017-3435

Dear Mr. Ikhata:

RE: Review of Adopted 2014-2021 Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) Plan

Thank you for submitting Southern California Association of Governments' (SCAG) Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) Plan adopted on October 4, 2012. Pursuant to Government Code (GC) Section 65584.05(h), the Department of Housing and Community Development (Department) is required to approve RHNA plans for consistency with statutory requirements.

The Department is pleased to approve SCAG's adopted RHNA Plan upon finding it consistent with the Department's August 17, 2011 RHNA Determination. The Department accepts SCAG's Resolution 12-543-1 adopted October 4, 2012, determining, among other requirements, that its RHNA Plan also meets the requirement of GC Section 65584.04(i)(3) to be consistent with the Sustainable Communities Strategy in the Regional Transportation Plan. Provision 3 of SCAG's Resolution includes a statement that the "Regional Council finds that the Final RHNA is consistent with the 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) in that the Final RHNA was developed concurrent with SCAG's development of the Integrated Growth Forecast."

The Department is committed to assisting SCAG and its local governments prepare and implement updated housing elements that effectively address the region's housing need while also developing local land use strategies to maximize land resources and facilitate more transit oriented and compact development patterns. Implementing effective housing elements to encourage affordable housing, a variety of housing types, and infill and transit oriented development is critical to achieving housing, economic and environmental objectives, including greenhouse gas emission reduction goals of Senate Bill 375 (Chapter 728, Statutes of 2008).

The Department commends SCAG's leadership in coordinating development of its RHNA plan with its SCS/RTP to improve housing and transportation planning. We appreciate the assistance provided by SCAG staff throughout the RHNA process. If you have any questions, or need further assistance, please contact me or Anda Draghici, Senior Housing Policy Specialist, at (916) 445-4728.

Sincerely,

Glen A. Campora
Assistant Deputy Director

COASTAL CONSERVANCY

Staff Recommendation
January 19, 2012

Los Angeles Rainwater Harvesting Project

Project No. 11-072
Project Manager: David Hayes

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Authorization to disburse up to \$714,600 to The River Project to develop the Los Angeles Rainwater Harvesting Project as part of the City of Los Angeles 'Green Streets Initiative' program.

LOCATION: City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County

PROGRAM CATEGORY: Integrated Coastal and Marine Resources Protection

EXHIBITS

Exhibit 1: [Project Location](#)

Exhibit 2: [Area Map](#)

Exhibit 3: [Project Letters](#)

RESOLUTION AND FINDINGS:

Staff recommends that the State Coastal Conservancy adopt the following resolution pursuant to Sections 31220 of the Public Resources Code:

“The State Coastal Conservancy hereby authorizes disbursement of up to seven hundred fourteen thousand six hundred dollars (\$714,600) to The River Project to develop the Los Angeles Rainwater Harvesting Project, for water quality and conservation purposes subject to the condition that prior to disbursement of funds The River Project shall submit the following for the review and approval of the Executive Officer of the Conservancy:

1. A work program, including budget and schedule;
2. Evidence that The River Project has secured all of the remaining funds, or staff time commitments needed to complete the project.”

Staff further recommends that the Conservancy adopt the following findings:

“Based on the accompanying staff report and attached exhibits, the State Coastal Conservancy hereby finds that:

LOS ANGELES RAINWATER HARVESTING PROJECT

1. The proposed project is consistent with the current Project Selection Criteria and Guidelines.
 2. The proposed authorization is consistent with the purposes and objectives of Chapters 5.5 of Division 21 of the Public Resources Code, regarding integrated coastal and marine resources protection.
 3. The River Project is a nonprofit organization existing under Section 501(c)(3) of the U.S. Internal Revenue Code, and whose principal charitable purposes are consistent with Division 21 of the Public Resources Code.”
-

PROJECT SUMMARY:

The River Project (TRP) will implement the Los Angeles Rainwater Harvesting Project to facilitate widespread implementation of residential stormwater harvesting in the City of Los Angeles. The proposed project would contribute to the City’s long-term water supply goals of increased conservation and development of a more sustainable local supply. The water that is captured and infiltrated will further augment the San Fernando groundwater basin, which has historically provided between 10 and 15 percent of the City’s total water supply, as well as provide significant benefits for water quality at beaches throughout Los Angeles County.

This project will develop standard plans to guide homeowners installing stormwater harvesting improvements on their own property. The standard plans will be reviewed by a City of Los Angeles Technical Advisory Committee and will be tested at a minimum of twenty-four demonstration households. These demonstration sites will be monitored for two years, and data collected through this project will be used to document the costs and the benefits of future investments in these projects. Finally, the project will provide standard plans for inclusion in an updated version of the City’s Rainwater Harvesting Manual and as the City’s Green Residence Standards to be adopted and incorporated into the City’s “Green Streets Initiative” program. When completed the Green Residential Standard Plans can be replicated in the Los Angeles River watershed and communities elsewhere in the City of Los Angeles.

The standard plans will be developed for a variety of stormwater harvesting techniques, including: rain gardens,¹ French drains (which capture the storm water), dry wells, graywater systems, Hollywood driveways,² cisterns, lawn removal, native plants and edible landscapes. The plans will address Best Management Practice (BMPs), material types, availability, constructability, maintenance, and the cost for installation. Based upon the City’s technical review, the plans will be further developed to 80% preliminary standard plans. The plans will be user-friendly, designed for easy approval by the Planning Department, and made widely available through web, YouTube and other social media, including City department website links. A series of hands-on intensive workshops will also be provided by TRP to teach

¹ A rain garden is a landscaped, shallow depression that allows rain to be collected and seep naturally into the ground. This helps recharge the groundwater supply and prevents polluted runoff (nonpoint source pollution).

² Hollywood Driveways typically have a dividing strip of grass or other media in order to reduce the amount of impervious surface.

LOS ANGELES RAINWATER HARVESTING PROJECT

participants about watershed management, site evaluation, landscape design, soil science and mulching principles, native plants, irrigation, and maintenance.

TRP will work with at least two dozen homeowners to design individualized suites of rainwater harvesting and water conservation techniques on their properties (as a test in developing the standardized plans). The project, as authorized, will fund some materials and design assistance by TRP. Projects will be designed to be affordable for average homeowners, and will be designed and implemented by the residents themselves. Participating homeowners will be required to contribute the required labor on their project as well as another residence in order to build a community of rain harvesters. The actual installation of the rainwater harvesting materials will be provided by the landowners' efforts, or 'sweat equity'. Participating homeowners will commit to maintaining rain harvest projects for a minimum of two years, when post-project performance data collection by TRP will be completed. These techniques will include rain gardens, French drains (which capture the storm water), dry wells, graywater systems, Hollywood driveways, cisterns, lawn removal, native plants and edible landscapes.

The Los Angeles Rainwater Harvest project is one of the multi-benefit projects proposed by the Neighborhood Council from the Tujunga/Pacoima Watershed Plan and is supported by a variety of governmental agencies and non-profit organizations. (See Project Letters; Ex. 3)

TRP is a tax-exempt, 501(c) (3) nonprofit, dedicated to planning for natural resource protection, conservation, enhancement, and revitalization of rivers and watershed lands in Los Angeles County. TRP has been active in the Tujunga/Pacoima area for nearly a decade, undertaking such projects as Tujunga Wash Hydrodynamic Study, planning and interpretive work for the Taylor Yard/Rio de Los Angeles State Park, and for the Sepulveda Basin Habitat enhancement plan. Additionally, TRP has done extensive work on the Tujunga/Pacoima Watershed and produced a comprehensive management plan for the Tujunga Wash sub-watershed.

Site Description:

The Los Angeles Rainwater Harvesting project will take place in the Tujunga/Pacoima sub-watershed of the Los Angeles River. The heaviest rain volumes in the Los Angeles River Watershed tend to be concentrated in the upper Tujunga/Pacoima watershed, with rainfall averages above 15 inches/year. The soils with the highest percolation rates are also located in these foothills and along historic stream courses in the area. The project is sited in this upper watershed region to take advantage of its inherent qualities, and designed to enhance opportunities for localized capture and infiltration of storm water, reduce flood potential in the area, replace water-intensive non-native vegetation with native habitat, and increase conservation practices by homeowners.

Project History:

The River Project has been actively engaged in watershed restoration efforts in Los Angeles for a dozen years, working with the Coastal Conservancy on a variety of projects. With funding from the Coastal Conservancy, TRP undertook scientific studies to determine surface and ground water quality at Taylor Yard, now the site of Rio de Los Angeles State Park; assisted with restoration projects at Sepulveda Basin; and engaged in community

LOS ANGELES RAINWATER HARVESTING PROJECT

outreach and river greenway design for the Valleyheart Greenway along the Los Angeles River. TRP produced the “Hydrodynamic Study of the Tujunga Wash” with funding from the Coastal Conservancy in 2002, and the “Tujunga/Pacoima Watershed Plan” with funding from the CalFed Watershed Program in 2008, both of which have led to this project.

Additionally, characteristics of this project were identified in the recommendations from the Los Angeles Rain Barrel Harvest Project, as the next key step in developing a comprehensive and functional rainwater harvesting policy in the City of Los Angeles.

Consistent with the goals of The Los Angeles Rain Barrel project funded by the Santa Monica Bay Restoration Commission (SMBRC), this project is complimentary with a wider variety of rain harvesting techniques of the Rain Barrel Project; however the project location was outside of SMBRC’s jurisdiction. TRP solicited funding from the Coastal Conservancy because of our natural resource conservation work in the Los Angeles watershed.

PROJECT FINANCING

Coastal Conservancy	\$714,600
City of Los Angeles	\$27,000
Total Project Costs	<u>\$741,600*</u>

Funding for this project is anticipated to come from the fiscal year 2009/10 appropriation of the Safe Drinking Water, Water Quality and Supply, Flood Control Protection Bond Act of 2006 (“Proposition 84”). Proposition 84 authorizes the use of these funds for projects that prevent contamination and degradation of coastal waters and watersheds consistent with the Conservancy’s enabling legislation. (Public Resources Code Section 75060(a)). The proposed project is consistent with the Conservancy’s legislation, Division 21 of the Public Resources Code; as described below (Public Resources Code Section 75074).

*Not shown in the project financing is a commitment of valuable senior staff time for consultation with the Technical Advisory Committee; from the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (\$12,000 in funds or materials plus staff time up to \$13,000), Generation Water (\$15,000); from the City Bureau of Sanitation, the Department of Building and Safety and the Department of Planning (staff time of up to \$85,000). The estimated staff service contribution is approximately \$98,000, in addition to the \$27,000 in funds, materials and rebates reflected in the project financing table. Although there is interest throughout the City departments, as evidenced by the attached support letters, its ability to help fund this project is limited to in-kind services and a rebate program now under consideration. This is an important contribution to achieving the overall goals of this project, to ensure that the residential rainwater harvesting methods meet a standard that is acceptable to City departments and is supported by a user friendly permitting process.

CONSISTENCY WITH CONSERVANCY'S ENABLING LEGISLATION:

This project would be undertaken pursuant to Chapter 5. of the Conservancy's enabling legislation, Division 21 of the Public Resources Code, regarding integrated coastal and marine resources protection. Section 31220(a) authorizes the Conservancy to undertake and award grants for projects that meet one or more criteria of Section 31220(b). Consistent with Section 31220(b) (7), the proposed project will help reduce the impact of population and economic pressures on coastal and marine resources. The retrofit of residential areas will help reduce storm-water run-off into the Los Angeles River and it will serve as a model for the City as a whole.

Section 31220(c) requires that projects funded under Section 31220 be consistent with the Integrated Watershed Management Program established under Section 30947, local watershed management plans, if available, and water quality control plans adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board and regional water quality control boards; and include a monitoring and evaluation component. As discussed in detail below under "Consistency with Local Watershed Management Plan/State Water Quality Control Plan," the proposed project is consistent with local and state watershed plans. In addition, the project includes a monitoring and evaluation component.

CONSISTENCY WITH CONSERVANCY'S 2007 STRATEGIC PLAN GOAL(S) & OBJECTIVE(S):

Consistent with **Goal 6, Objective 6.F** of the Conservancy's 2007 Strategic Plan, the proposed project will improve water quality to benefit coastal resources, and promote conservation water resource policies concerning urban watershed runoff for beneficial uses and provide funding for projects that address pollution cleanup and prevention, using best-management practices.

CONSISTENCY WITH CONSERVANCY'S PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA & GUIDELINES:

The proposed project is consistent with the Conservancy's Project Selection Criteria and Guidelines, last updated on June 4, 2009, in the following respects:

Required Criteria

1. **Promotion of the Conservancy's statutory programs and purposes:** See the "Consistency with Conservancy's Enabling Legislation" section above.
2. **Consistency with purposes of the funding source:** See the "Project Financing" section above.
3. **Support of the public:** The project has broad support. City Council District 6, the community partners such as Panorama City Neighborhood Council, and nonprofit advocates including TreePeople and Green LA support the project for its multi-beneficial aspects and the fact that it will provide homeowners throughout the region with the tools to implement a variety of water smart projects on their own. See Project Letters, Exhibit 3.

LOS ANGELES RAINWATER HARVESTING PROJECT

4. **Location:** This project is located in the Tujunga/Pacoima Wash watershed which drains to the Los Angeles River. Its location serves well as a model for the upper Los Angeles River watershed and when completed will benefit coastal resources by treating runoff and reducing the amount of runoff and pollution that reaches the coast. Perhaps even more important, the project will result in a scalable approach to harvesting and conserving rainwater for the entire upper Los Angeles River region.
5. **Need:** Without the Conservancy's funding assistance the City of Los Angeles would not have the resources to develop the prototype Rain Harvest standards. This comprehensive approach advances the Los Angeles Rain Barrel project concepts of rainwater harvesting to a variety of best management practices for residential retrofits that includes field tested methods standardized acceptable by city agencies. The initial labor intensive recruitment and training workshops, field work, and social media materials could not be performed by city staff. Without Conservancy funding, this timely and scalable project would not occur for an undetermined time.
6. **Greater-than-local interest:** The project will help improve water quality, and recharge a huge groundwater basin that drains the entire San Fernando Valley. The project is designed to be replicated throughout the Los Angeles River Watershed, the City of Los Angeles and provide significant benefits for water quality at beaches throughout Los Angeles County.
7. **Sea level rise vulnerability:** The project area is located within the Los Angeles river watershed, at an elevation of approximately 814 feet above sea level, and not subject to tidal influences.

Additional Criteria

8. **Resolution of more than one issue:** This project will help resolve local water quality issues, serve as a model for regional water quality and supply, and will encourage planting native plants and thereby creating wildlife habitat. Additionally, it will provide a helpful "Green Residential Standard Plans" for city review of several rainwater harvesting methods. The plans will be designed for easy approval by the Los Angeles Planning Department, and other City departments which addresses one of the primary factors that currently prevents homeowners from installing rainwater harvesting methods other than rain barrels on their properties.
9. **Innovation:** This project demonstrates an innovative and comprehensive approach to solving several issues at once by: providing public access to "how-to" workshops for homeowners and resulting in a variety of model residential retrofits for do-it-yourself homeowners.
10. **Readiness:** The River Project is prepared to begin as soon as a grant agreement is finalized. The Technical Advisory Committee from the City departments is also ready to commence work on the project.
11. **Realization of prior Conservancy goals:** "See "Project History"
13. **Cooperation:** The project is collaboration between City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, Department of Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation, Department of Building and Safety and the Department of Planning, State Water Resources Control Board and the non-profit The River Project.

LOS ANGELES RAINWATER HARVESTING PROJECT

14. **Vulnerability from climate change impacts other than sea level rise:** Preliminary weather scenarios are projected for increased cycles of drought and wet periods within the Southern California area, including Tujunga/Pacoima Watershed. Increased drought periods would potentially reduce the amount of rain that can be stored in surface impoundments and subsequently infiltrated groundwater basins. Climate change is likely to impact the amount of imported water available to use within Southern California as well. Increased storm intensities could potentially exceed the capacity of existing flood protection system within the watershed and the rain gardens and other landscape treatments would ameliorate that impact to some degree.

The heaviest rain volumes in the Los Angeles River Watershed tend to be concentrated in the upper Tujunga/Pacoima watershed. Moreover, the soils with the highest percolation rates, are located in the foothills and along historic stream courses and finally, the San Fernando Groundwater Basin underlies the project area, and recent analysis indicates that there is underutilized storage water capacity within the basin.

15. **Minimization of greenhouse gas emissions:** The residential projects are small in nature and will be performed by individual homeowners using hand tools with little or no emissions.

CONSISTENCY WITH LOCAL WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN/ STATE WATER QUALITY CONTROL PLAN:

The project is consistent with the Los Angeles River Restoration Master Plan, adopted by the City in 2007. The project addresses seven of the nine goals of The River Project's "Tujunga/Pacoima Watershed Plan" (2007) and assists with the goals of the greater Los Angeles IRWMP (2008); the City's Water Supply Action Plan "Securing LA's Water Supply" (2008); Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation (LABOS) "Water Quality Compliance Master Plan for Urban Runoff" (2009), and "Climate LA: Municipal Program Implementing the Green LA Climate Action Plan" (2008). The Proposed Rainwater Harvest Project is a project listed in the "Tujunga/Pacoima Watershed Plan" (Section 8.2).

COMPLIANCE WITH CEQA:

The proposed project is categorically exempt from review under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), pursuant to 14 California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 15307 and 15308 because the development of the rainwater harvesting standards by the various City departments are designed to assure the maintenance, restoration, or enhancement of a natural resource and the process involves procedures for protection of the environment. With respect to the projects to be monitored by The River Project, the residential projects are categorically exempt pursuant to 14 CCR section 15304 (minor alterations to land) in that the residential projects involve minor, private alterations in the condition of land and vegetation which do not involve removal of healthy, mature, scenic trees. Additionally the proposed project is characterized as gardening or landscaping, including the replacement of existing conventional landscaping with water efficient landscaping, and therefore also exempt under 14 CCR Section 15304(b). Upon approval, staff will file a Notice of Exemption.