

**Proposition O - Clean Water Bond Program  
Project Funding Category Expenditures**

Ballot Measure Categories	Cat. No.	Approved Expenditure (Millions)	Expenditures as of 6/30/13 (Millions)	Total Unexpended Budgeted To Date	Difference Balance	Recommended Projects					Remaining Approved Expenditure	
						Machado Lake Rehab.	Albion Prk. Improv.	Aliso Creek-Limekillin Creek Restore	Taylor Yard-G2 Parcel	Catch Basin Phase IV		
River, Lakes, Beaches, Bays and Ocean Water Quality Protection Projects	1	\$250	\$130	\$98.60	\$21	\$16.60						\$5
Water Conservation, Drinking Water and Source Protection Projects	2	\$75	\$31.60	\$22.30	\$21		\$11.50					\$10
Flood Water Reduction, River and Neighborhood Parks that Prevent Polluted Runoff and Improve Water Quality Projects	3	\$100	\$26.70	\$60.20	\$13			\$1.50	\$11.50			\$0
Storm Water Capture, Clean-up and Re-Use Projects	4	\$75	\$28.50	\$15.60	\$31				\$14.50	\$6.10		\$10
<b>TOTALS</b>		\$500	\$217	\$197	\$87	\$16.60	\$11.50	\$1.50	\$26.00	\$6.10		\$25

Active Projects

Project Title	Council District	Funding Bank Number	Phase	% Complete	Original Budget	Budget Adjustments	Current Budget	Notes
Albion Dairy Park - Demolition & Remediation	1	7	Construction	88	\$ 3,956,400	\$ 3,090,000	\$ 8,956,400	Funding from Land acquisition escrow acct.
Aviation Green Alley South	9		Pre-Design	1	\$ 1,602,642		\$ 1,602,642	
Broadway Neighborhood Stormwater Greenway	9		Pre-Design	1	\$ 4,626,502		\$ 4,626,502	
Catch Basin Opening Screen Covers Phase III	All	6	Construction	65	\$ 44,500,000	\$ (1,748,574)	\$ 42,751,426	Funds to be used for optimization
Echo Park Lake Rehabilitation	13	3	Construction	89	\$ 84,283,313	\$ (38,866,524)	\$ 45,416,789	
Elmer Avenue Phase II: Elmer Paseo	6		Construction	64	\$ 829,000		\$ 829,000	
Glenncooks/Sunland Stormwater Capture	6		Construction	64	\$ 508,686		\$ 508,686	
Machado Lake-Phase I (Wilmington Drain)	15	3	Construction	11	\$ 21,048,911		\$ 21,048,911	
Machado Lake Ecosystem Rehabilitation	15	4	Bid/Award	50	\$ 89,523,887		\$ 89,523,887	Budget increase needed. Approx. \$15 to \$20M
Pennar Water Quality Improvement Phase I	11	4	Construction	89	\$ 20,754,800		\$ 20,754,800	
Pennar Water Quality Improvement Phase II	11	4	Design	58	\$ 2,830,200		\$ 2,830,200	
Rory M. Shaw Wetlands Park	6		Design	75	\$ 7,800,000		\$ 7,800,000	
Rosecrans Recreation Center Stormwater Enhancements	15	10	Construction	88	\$ 4,828,119		\$ 4,828,119	
Santa Monica Bay Low Flow Diversion Package 3 Phase 2	11	2	Bid/Award	77	\$ -	\$ 13,855,884	\$ 13,855,884	Funding from Packages 1, 2, 3, and 4.
Taylor Yard River Park - Parcel G2 Land Acquisition*	1	7	Hold	N/A	\$ 12,440,000		\$ 12,440,000	
Temescal Canyon Park Stormwater Phase I	11	4	Construction	83	\$ 14,847,435		\$ 14,847,435	
Temescal Canyon Park Stormwater Phase II	11	4	Design	58	\$ 3,688,965		\$ 3,688,965	
Westchester Stormwater BMP	11	4	Hold	N/A	\$ 32,722,000		\$ 32,722,000	
<b>Total</b>					<b>\$ 380,892,480</b>	<b>\$ (23,859,214)</b>	<b>\$ 357,033,266</b>	

Completed Projects

Project Title	Council District	Status	Expended to Date	Cost to Complete	Estimated Total Cost	Original Budget	Budget Adjustments	Estimated Savings/(Shortfall)	Notes
Albion Dairy Park - Land Acquisition	1	Closed Out	\$ 17,537,311	\$ 22,889	\$ 17,560,200	\$ 17,560,000		\$ 219,200	referred to land remediation
Catch Basin Inserts and Coverings Phase I	All	Closed Out	\$ 14,702,886	\$ -	\$ 14,702,886	\$ 17,000,000	\$ (2,297,114)	\$ -	
Catch Basin Opening Screen Covers Phase II	All	Closed Out	\$ 9,650,788	\$ -	\$ 9,650,788	\$ 10,000,000	\$ (349,212)	\$ -	
Chavez Ground Water Improvement	6	Closed Out	\$ 2,527,873	\$ -	\$ 2,527,873	\$ 3,040,000	\$ (512,127)	\$ -	
Grand Blvd. Tree Wells	11	Closed Out	\$ 713,039	\$ -	\$ 713,039	\$ 1,075,927	\$ (362,888)	\$ -	
Hansen Dam Wetlands Restoration	7	Closed Out	\$ 1,797,321	\$ 423,381	\$ 2,220,702	\$ 2,220,702	\$ -	\$ -	
Imperial Highway Sunken Median Stormwater BMP	11	Closed Out	\$ 1,301,724	\$ -	\$ 1,301,724	\$ 2,723,403	\$ (1,421,679)	\$ -	
Inner Cabrillo Beach Bacterial Water Quality Improvement	15	Closed Out	\$ 6,921,409	\$ 509,800	\$ 7,431,209	\$ 8,000,000	\$ (568,791)	\$ 568,791	
La Cienega/Fairfax Stormwater BMP - CANCELED	10	Closed Out	\$ 688,569	\$ -	\$ 688,569	\$ 7,667,388	\$ (6,978,819)	\$ -	
Los Angeles Zoo Parking Lot	4	Closed Out	\$ 6,240,455	\$ -	\$ 6,240,455	\$ 13,304,243	\$ (7,063,788)	\$ -	
River Vista Recreation Center Stormwater BMP	11	Optimization	\$ 3,956,188	\$ 560,003	\$ 4,516,191	\$ 4,516,186	\$ 5	\$ -	
Ortiz Green Street	13	Closed Out	\$ 198,924	\$ -	\$ 198,924	\$ 386,924	\$ (187,976)	\$ -	
Peck Park Canyon Enhancement	15	Optimization	\$ 5,289,271	\$ 750,000	\$ 6,039,271	\$ 6,190,000	\$ (150,729)	\$ -	Project savings used for Fig. 3, Phase 2.
Santa Monica Bay Low Flow Diversion Upgrades, Pkg. 1	11	Closed out in progress	\$ 4,426,787	\$ -	\$ 4,426,787	\$ 6,814,377	\$ (2,387,590)	\$ -	Project savings used for Fig. 3, Phase 2.
Santa Monica Bay Low Flow Diversion Upgrades, Pkg. 2	11	Closed out in progress	\$ 2,026,183	\$ -	\$ 2,026,183	\$ 3,380,111	\$ (1,353,928)	\$ -	Project savings used for Fig. 3, Phase 2.
Santa Monica Bay Low Flow Diversion Upgrades, Pkg. 3	11	Closed out in progress	\$ 12,925,881	\$ -	\$ 12,925,881	\$ 20,634,036	\$ (7,708,155)	\$ -	Project savings used for Fig. 3, Phase 2.
Santa Monica Bay Low Flow Diversion Upgrades, Pkg. 4	11	Closed out in progress	\$ 3,848,120	\$ 36,173	\$ 3,884,293	\$ 6,290,504	\$ (2,406,211)	\$ -	Project savings used for Fig. 3, Phase 2.
South Los Angeles Wetlands Park (includes Site Readiness)	9	Optimization	\$ 9,697,448	\$ 2,600,754	\$ 12,298,202	\$ 16,078,202	\$ (3,780,000)	\$ -	Item to RFP for land
Strathern Pit Mithouse - Land Acquisition	6	Payment pending	\$ 1,655	\$ 9,998,965	\$ 10,000,620	\$ 10,000,000	\$ 620	\$ -	
Westminster Dog Park Stormwater BMP	11	Closed Out	\$ 687,888	\$ -	\$ 687,888	\$ 1,438,755	\$ (750,867)	\$ -	
Westside Park Rainwater Irrigation	10	Closed out in progress	\$ 4,552,181	\$ -	\$ 4,552,181	\$ 6,504,589	\$ (1,952,408)	\$ -	
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$ 109,690,876</b>	<b>\$ 124,662,241</b>	<b>\$ 166,464,323</b>	<b>\$ (41,071,771)</b>	<b>\$ 115,392,552</b>		

TOTALS FOR ACTIVE AND COMPLETED PROJECTS \$ 527,347,403 \$ 64,931,985 \$ 462,415,417  
 TOTAL ADJUSTMENTS APPROVED BY COUNCIL ON MAY 26, 2013 = \$ (25,145,955)  
 TOTAL ADJUSTMENTS RECOMMENDED TO BE APPROVED BY COUNCIL = \$ (39,786,080)

RESULTS OF OPTIMIZATION WORK

PROJECTS:	Pollution Reduction		Water Quality		Comments/Explanations	
	Before Construction	After Construction	Before Construction	After Construction		
Hansen Dam Wetlands Restoration	7	<p><u>Average Concentration</u>                      E.Coli (geomean): 2809.76 MPN/100ml                      Total Copper: 37.88 ug/l                      Total Lead: 1.53 ug/l                      Total Zinc: 22.19 ug/l</p>	<p><u>Average Concentration</u>                      E.Coli (geomean): 0.00 MPN/100ml                      Total Copper: 0.00 ug/l                      Total Lead: 0.00 ug/l                      Total Zinc: 0.00 ug/l</p>	Bad	Good	The project results in 100% filtration/infiltration and therefore 100% capture of pollutants. Selected pollutants are shown here as relevant to LA River TMDL numeric targets. 100% pollutant capture reduces sources of contamination to the LA River.
Mar Vista Recreation Center Stormwater BMP	11	<p><u>Dry Weather Average Concentration</u>                      E.Coli (geomean): 187.3 MPN/100ml                      Total Copper: 9.8 ug/L                      Total Lead: 29.1 ug/L                      Total Zinc: 46.3 ug/L</p> <p><u>Wet Weather Average Concentration</u>                      E.Coli (geomean): 1332.9 MPN/100ml                      Total Copper: 31.4 ug/L                      Total Lead: 9.7 ug/L                      Total Zinc: 158.9 ug/L</p>	<p><u>Dry Weather Pollutant Load Captured</u>                      E.Coli : 0.00 MPN/100ml                      Total Copper: 1.00 grams                      Total Lead: 2.98 grams                      Total Zinc: 4.73 grams</p> <p><u>Wet Weather Pollutant Load Captured</u>                      E.Coli : 0.00 MPN/100ml                      Total Copper: 28.90 grams                      Total Lead: 8.90 grams                      Total Zinc: 146.13 grams</p>	Bad	<p><u>Dry Weather</u>                      Good</p> <p><u>Wet Weather</u>                      Good</p>	During dry weather, the project results in 100% capture and therefore 100% capture of pollutants. Selected pollutants are shown here as relevant to Ballona Creek TMDL numeric targets. 100% pollutant capture reduces sources of contamination to Ballona Creek. Monitoring will continue during irrigation of the park.
Peck Park Canyon Enhancement	15	<p><u>Pollutant Load</u>                      Fecal Coliform : 49594 MPN/100ml                      Total Copper: 0.38 lbs                      Total Lead: 0.16 lbs                      Total Zinc: 2.13 lbs</p>	<p><u>Pollutant Load</u>                      Fecal Coliform : 0.00 MPN/100ml                      Total Copper: 0.00 lbs                      Total Lead: 0.00 lbs                      Total Zinc: 0.00 lbs</p>	Bad	Good	The project results in 100% infiltration and therefore 100% capture of pollutants. Selected pollutants are shown here as relevant to Dominguez Channel (DC) TMDL numeric targets. 100% pollutant capture reduces sources of contamination to the DC.
South Los Angeles Wetlands Park (Includes Site Readiness)	9	<p><u>Average Concentration</u>                      E.Coli (geomean): 140743 MPN/100ml                      Total Copper: 28.96 ug/l                      Total Lead: 24.06 ug/l                      Total Zinc: 508.50 ug/l                      Ammonia-N: 1.42 mg/l</p>	<p><u>Median Reduction</u>                      E.Coli: 169 MPN/100ml                      Total Copper: 3.99 ug/l                      Total Lead: 1.40 ug/l                      Total Zinc: 9.26 ug/l                      Ammonia-N: 0.11 mg/l</p>	Bad	Good	All pollutants analyzed have been reduced. Selected pollutants are shown here as relevant to LA River TMDL numeric targets. Water quality is good since applicable pollutants are below TMDL numeric targets.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES  
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

0610-00029-0000

Date: May 18, 2005

To: The Council

From: William T Fujioka, City Administrative Officer



Gerry Miller, Chief Legislative Analyst

Subject: **PROPOSITION O - PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA****Summary**

In November 2004, Proposition O was approved which authorized the issuance of \$500 million in bonds for projects to improve water quality and to protect public health and the environment. The ballot language for Proposition O requires the Council to adopt criteria for the selection of projects within 180 days of passage of the bond measure and assigns the responsibility of developing project selection criteria to the Administrative Oversight Committee (AOC) and the Citizens Oversight Advisory Committee (COAC). Both the AOC and the COAC have approved the project selection criteria included with this report (see Attachment).

The criteria establish three broad categories and weighting that would be used in the evaluation of projects for funding from Proposition O as follows:

- Water Quality (40 percent);
- Multiple-Objectives (30 percent); and,
- Project Feasibility/Readiness/Financial (30 percent).

The Bureau of Sanitation (BOS) will be the lead agency for evaluation of projects considered for funding from Proposition O and will forward recommendations for funding to the AOC and the COAC. The recommendations from the BOS will preliminarily group the projects into three categories: (1) projects eligible for funding; (2) projects requiring additional modifications to satisfy eligibility for funding that will be resubmitted for future consideration; and (3) projects ineligible for funding. The AOC and the COAC will then forward to the Council recommendations to fund projects from Proposition O.

**Recommendation**

That the Council approves the project selection criteria included with this report (see Attachment) that would be used in the evaluation of projects for funding from Proposition O.

**Fiscal Impact Statement**

The recommendation included within this report would approve the selection criteria to be used in the evaluation of projects for funding from Proposition O. Proposition O authorizes the issuance of up to \$500 million in bonds for projects to improve water quality and to protect public health and the environment. However, there are no appropriations or expenditures associated with consideration of the project selection criteria. There is no impact on the General Fund.

*WTF:JFC:06050210c*

# Proposition O

## 1. Background

On November 2, 2004, the voters of the City of Los Angeles overwhelmingly passed Proposition O, which authorized the City to issue a series of general obligation bonds for up to \$500 million for projects to protect public health by cleaning up pollution, including bacteria and trash, in the City's watercourses, beaches and the ocean, in order to meet Federal Clean Water Act requirements. In addition, the measure will fund improvements to protect water quality, provide flood protection, and increase water conservation, habitat protection, and open space. The bonds will allow the City to purchase property and/or improve municipal properties for projects that:

- Protect rivers, lakes, beaches, and the ocean
- Conserve and protect drinking water and other waters sources
- Reduce flooding and use neighborhood parks to decrease polluted runoff
- Capture, clean up, and reuse stormwater.

An Administrative Oversight Committee (AOC) and Citizens Oversight Advisory Committee (COAC) have been established to provide oversight of the bond funds. Bond funds will be paid for by property taxes with an average estimated tax increase on a \$350,000 home of \$35.00 per year for 24 years. Project funds can be used for project planning, design, advertisement, bid and award, construction, construction management, and inspection.

## 2. Proposition O Objective

The ballot measure approved by the City of Los Angeles voters established the objective of funding projects that fall within one or more of the following categories:

- River, Lakes, Beaches, Bays, and Ocean Water Quality Protection Projects
- Water Conservation, Drinking Water, and Source Protection Projects
- Flood Water Reduction, River and Neighborhood Parks that Prevent Polluted Runoff and Improve Water Quality Projects
- Stormwater Capture, Clean-up, and Re-Use Projects

## 3. Eligibility

All projects must meet the following eligibility requirements. The project must demonstrably reduce loads of pollutants to impaired waters. The project shall not negatively affect flood protection. The project shall not lead to a net loss of habitat or hardening of creeks or rivers. The project shall not exacerbate any existing environmental problems in the vicinity or downstream of the project. Only those projects meeting these requirements will be evaluated against the following criteria.

## 4. Criteria

The primary purpose of projects selected is to improve water quality by reducing pollutant loads to the impaired waters of the City of Los Angeles. In addition, whenever feasible projects are to be designed to satisfy multiple objectives and purposes including increasing water supply, improving flood management, creating or enhancing open space, habitat, and recreation benefits. Projects should also consider source control measures, leverage funds, promote collaboration with other agencies and utilize a strategic adaptive management approach. The types of projects designed to protect public health, improve water quality, conserve water, and reduce flooding may include: storm water cleanup, control, and diversion; water quality, pollution, and bacteria control; trash capture; urban lakes and bay improvements; habitat/wetlands restoration and development; storm water retention facilities/parks/greenbelts; and water conservation/reuse facilities.

The primary criteria are divided into three categories, with the following weighting: Water Quality Improvements at 40%, Achieves Multiple Objectives at 30%, and Project Feasibility/Readiness/Financial at 30% of the overall scoring. Within each criterion there are several sub-criteria that will help to determine the overall ranking of each proposed project.

The following table indicates the criteria and subcriteria and the associated evaluation scale:

Criteria		Sub-Criteria	Scale
Water Quality Improvements	40%	Pollution Problem Identified by Adopted TMDL	Yes/No
		Meets Wet Weather Water Quality Regulations	Low/Med/High
		Meets Dry Weather Water Quality Regulations	Low/Med/High
		Reduces Pollutant Loads	Low/Med/High
Multiple-Objectives	30%	Enhances Drinking Water Source	Low/Med/High
		Provides Potential for Beneficial Reuse	Low/Med/High
		Enhances Environment	Yes/No
		Provides Open Space/Recreational Areas	Yes/No
		Reduces Flooding	Yes/No
		Consistent with the Integrated Resources Plan, the Los Angeles River Revitalization Plan and the Watershed/Water Management Plan	Yes/No
Project Feasibility/Readiness/Financial	30%	Durability of Project	Low/Med/High
		Cost of Project	Low/Med/High
		Relies on Proven Technology	Yes/No
		Project Ready for Implementation	Yes/No
		Potential for External Funding	Yes/No
		Strong Community Support	Yes/No

*Note: All projects must be monitored by the Environmental Monitoring Division or Watershed Protection Division of the Bureau of Sanitation for water quality benefits, pre- and post- construction.*

#### Water Quality Improvements:

- *Pollution Problem Identified by Adopted TMDL:* Indicate if there is a TMDL that is adopted for the area in which the project is proposed. What problem will the project address and how will it achieve or contribute to a solution?
- *Meets Wet Weather Water Quality Regulations:* Describe the extent to which the project assists in meeting wet weather water quality standards
- *Meets Dry Weather Water Quality Regulations:* Describe the extent to which the project assists in meeting dry weather water quality standards
- *Reduces Pollutant Loads:* Describe the extent to which the project reduces pollutant loading and list the types of pollutants reduced.

#### Multiple-Objectives:

- *Enhances Drinking Water Source:* Describe the extent to which the project provides drinking water benefits.
- *Provides Potential for Beneficial Reuse:* Describe the extent to which the project includes elements that will provide beneficial use of stormwater runoff.
- *Enhances Environment:* Indicate if and how the project includes elements that provide for an environmental benefit (such as habitat restoration, aesthetic enhancements, etc.).
- *Provides Open Space/Recreational Areas:* Indicate if and how the project includes any element that provides open space or recreational areas. Will the new or enhanced open space or recreational area be located within a poor or underserved area of the City.
- *Reduces Flooding:* Indicate if and how the project assists in reducing flooding in the immediate area.
- *Consistent with the Integrated Resources Plan, the Los Angeles River Revitalization Plan and the Watershed/Water Management Plan:* Is the project a stand alone feature that may have minimal impact on achieving regional water quality standards, but demonstrates a holistic approach; or is it consistent with a regional strategy to meeting water quality standards, such as the Integrated Resources Plan, the Los Angeles River Revitalization Plan and the Watershed/Water Management Plan.

#### Project Feasibility/Readiness/Financial:

- *Durability of Project:* Describe the length of time that the project would operate prior to replacement.
- *Cost of Project:* Describe the cost of the project (capital and O&M) and the cost per unit of pollutant removed.
- *Relies on Proven Technology:* Indicate if the project is using technology that has been proven to be effective and has been adopted at other locations in the country. If the project does not use technology currently in place elsewhere, describe whether and how the project may contribute to evaluating the effectiveness of an alternative BMP (Best Management Practices) with the potential for broad application.
- *Project Ready for Implementation:* Indicate the extent to which the project has been planned by including a detailed budget, an implementation schedule, status of environmental documentation (CEQA ready), the project's adaptability to



changing conditions, permitting requirements, and status of land acquisition activities, if applicable.

- *Potential for External Funding:* Describe the opportunities the project may have to obtain funding from non- Proposition O sources.
- *Strong Community Support:* Describe whether there is majority or consensus support from the affected community for the project. Include letters and resolutions or other indices of support from community groups and other stakeholders.

AOC and COAC will review, comment, and make recommendations relative to the Proposition O project priority list, based upon the above criteria. The Bureau of Sanitation will then group the projects into the following three categories based upon the recommendations of the AOC and COAC:

- **Category A:** These projects meet the Proposition O Eligibility Requirements and received high scores in the evaluation process. They will be immediately submitted to the City Council and the Mayor for their consideration.
- **Category B:** These projects will be required to make appropriate modifications to satisfy the Proposition O Eligibility Requirements and can be submitted for consideration in the future.
- **Category C:** These projects do not meet the Proposition O Objective and Project Eligibility Requirements and are deemed ineligible for Proposition O funding. They will be excluded from the selection process.