

DATE: March 21, 2016

TO: RMC Governing Board

FROM: Mark Stanley, Executive Officer

SUBJECT: Item 8: Rivers and Mountains Conservancy Proposition 1 (2014 Water Bond) Grant Program Update

PROGRAM AREA: All

RECOMMENDATION: Receive and file

BACKGROUND: On September 28, 2016 the RMC approved grant program guidelines which provided for project applications to be submitted for funding consideration. The timeline shown below is a summary of the schedule for action on the grant program.

Current Date	Action
July 23, 27, 28 & 30, 2015	Public Workshops, Review of Grant Program Guidelines & Public Comments
July 10-August 14, 2015	Public Comment Period
August 14-22, 2015	Revisions to Guidelines
August 24, 2015	Submit Guidelines to Natural Resources- Final Review
September 28, 2015	RMC Board approval for Guidelines
October-December 2015	Assemble Project Review Teams and Develop Grant Agreement
September 28-December 16, 2015	Call for Projects Phase
December 16, 2015	Due Date of RMC Grant Proposals
January 4, 2016	NEW Due Date for RMC Grant Proposals
January 25, 2016	RMC Board approved review of 44 Grant applications
February - March 2016	Staff Review of Grant applications
March 2016	RMC Board: Prop. 1 Grant Program Update
April 2016	Notice to Grant Applicants of Project Status
May 23, 2016	Recommendations for Board Consideration-Tier 1 Projects

During July 2015, RMC staff engaged in a series of public workshops to review the grant program guidelines and to receive public comments. The public comment period was from July 10 to August 14, 2015. Staff made revisions to the guidelines based on comments received and submitted to the Natural Resources for final review. The official call for projects began in October 2015. Upon consideration of grantees requesting additional time, the deadline was extended to January 4, 2016 from December 16, 2015.

The RMC received 44 grant applications for a grant request totaling \$49,079,697.50. The majority of grant requests were for the Urban Program, followed by River/Tributaries, and Mountains/Foothills.

The process used by staff to review the Proposition 1 applications was to distribute them into three teams consisting of a total of five reviewers. Each team was led by an RMC Project Manager, Marybeth Vergara, Luz Quinnell and Jose Gardea or Urbanism Advisors. RMC staff requested the assistance of Urbanism Advisors, a consulting firm headed by Jose Gardea to assist with the grant review and scoring process, partially due to the fact that there are only two RMC Project Managers and to be able to evenly distribute the grant applications among the three evaluation teams. This meant that two teams read and scored 14 total grant proposals, and the third team read and scored 16 grant proposals. Review teams are currently finalizing their grant proposals and scoring process. Scores will be based on an average score of the five total scores, to receive the final grant evaluation score based on the Project Evaluation Criteria. These final scores and recommendations for funding will be brought before the RMC Board at the May 23, 2016 board meeting. Finally, each project will be evaluated within the program area that it falls under: See **Exhibit 2- RMC Prop. 1 Evaluation Teams**.

Project applicants were asked to identify the program area for their project. Projects cannot be eligible for scoring from more than one program area (Section 3.1, Geographic Program Areas, RMC Prop.1 Grant Guidelines, page 10). Program areas are:

- **Urban Lands**—All land within the developed, urban core of the RMC territory that is NOT within the area identified for River/Tributary Parkways, or within the Mountains, Hills, and Foothills.
- **River/Tributary Parkways**—Land within one-quarter mile on either side of the centerline of a river or tributary within the RMC territory, but NOT within the Mountains, Hills and Foothills or Urban Land areas.
- **Mountains, Hills, and Foothills**—Land lying within the area of a named system of mountains, hills and foothills. More specifically, land lying within the geographic area of the San Gabriel Mountains, the San Jose, San Rafael, Montebello, Puente, Chino, Coyote, or Signal Hills, the San Gabriel foothills, and within the territory of the RMC but NOT within the Urban Lands or River/Tributary Parkways.

The applications sub totals for each of the program areas is as follows:

Mountains, Hills, Foothills	4	9%
Rivers/Tributaries	18	41%
Urban Lands	22	50%
TOTAL	44	100%

The Urban Lands project applications is the largest program area for this grant round, followed by the Rivers and Tributaries Program. It is also important to note that many of the Rivers/Tributaries projects are within the urban landscape such as the sphere of the Emerald Necklace area and Compton Creek. While the RMC Staff is still reviewing grant applications and will be making recommendations for funding at the May 2016 Board meeting, it will be a goal of the RMC to increase our project delivery to urban areas.

Staff also analyzed the distribution of project applications by Council of Government (COG) area:

COG	Number
Gateway	19
San Gabriel Valley	17
Orange County League of Cities	4
North Facing Slope/West SG Mtns/Upper Santa Clara River	0
Territory-wide	4

As can be seen from the COG chart above, it was a fairly even split between Gateway and San Gabriel Valley cities that submitted applications with 19 being submitted by cities represented by the Gateway COG and 17 submitted by cities from the San Gabriel Valley COG. In terms of regions, the cities represented by the Orange County League of Cities submitted four applications including the City of Fullerton (2), Irvine and Los Alamitos. This amount was followed by a total of four applications which are located within the larger territory of the RMC which includes the LA County Department of Public Works that submitted one application requesting funding for 30 regional parkway basins throughout unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County; the Slauson Wall Park Development Project submitted by the Trust for Public Land located in South Los Angeles; the Magic Johnson Water Wise Development Project submitted by LA County Department of Parks and Recreation, located in South LA; and the Watts Green Streets Phase II Project submitted by Grant Housing Economic Development Corporation located in the City of Los Angeles community of Watts.

Some of the entities that submitted several project applications (two or more) include: the Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation (2), the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (2) the City of Whittier (2), and the City of Long Beach (2). Among the non-profit entities the following organizations submitted more than two applications: Amigos de Los Rios (4) and The Trust for Public Land (2). The Watershed Conservation Authority (WCA) submitted four applications and the Los Cerritos Wetlands Authority (LCWA) submitted two grant applications.

The project types that were submitted for consideration are as follows:

Grant Type	Amount	Funding Request
Acquisition	4	
Planning	5	
Planning & Development/Watershed Improvement	25	
Development	10	
TOTAL	44	

All grant proposals are being evaluated using the Project Evaluation Criteria (PEC), see attached **Exhibit 1-Project Evaluation Criteria**. This PEC has a total score of 133 for the Urban Land Program Area, a total score of 133 for the Rivers/Tributaries Program Area and 123 for the Mountains/Foothills Program Area. In order to be considered a competitive grant proposal, RMC staff anticipate that grantees must obtain a target score of at least 85 or higher to be considered for funding. Once all grant applications have been evaluated and scored, RMC Staff will provide the scoring breakdown of each application, as well as a recommendation for full or partial funding. This report will be provided at the May 23, 2016 Board meeting.

Staff then identified which projects meet the very specific Project Eligibility criteria identified in the grant program guidelines as follows (Section 2.7, RMC Prop. 1 Grant Guidelines, page 8):

- Grant funds may be used for the acquisition, development, rehabilitation, restoration, and protection of land and water resources
- Land acquisition costs may include appraisals, land improvements, relocation costs, title reports, surveying, and escrow. Land must be acquired from willing sellers and at fair market value.
- Direct expenses include project-specific management costs such as CEQA/NEPA compliance, permitting, direct project administration and management.
- Projects that have lower overhead or no overhead costs will be deemed more competitive. The RMC may cap indirect and overhead costs at 10-15% of the total project cost.
- Proposition 1 funding has limited funding available for preparation of planning documents, such as watershed plan updates, CEQA compliance documents and other planning documents. (79735(d): Up to 10 percent of the funds available pursuant to this section may be allocated for project planning).

There are a large amount of projects that include Planning, Development and Watershed Improvement as part of the grant request versus those grant applications that are solely for planning. The projects that are requesting funds specifically for planning will be evaluated based on the total amount of funds available to the RMC from its Proposition 1 allocation of \$30 million. This means that a total amount of \$3 million is what will be available for these requests that are solely for planning. The amount of grant applications that are solely for planning totals five grant applications. However, RMC staff must set aside a portion of these funds for future competitive grant requests that will likely take place in the near future (2016-2018).

The majority of the grant applications that are requesting funds for planning, development and watershed improvements totals thirty five (35) grant requests. Along with the final project scores, RMC Staff will be performing a SWOC analysis (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Challenges) to determine the feasibility of these requests. In some instances, RMC Staff will contact the project applicants to get clarifications on certain components of the grant applications. For example, a city submitting a grant request for a land acquisition may receive a high score based on the Project Evaluation Criteria, however, land tenure might be in question, where the private landowner has not been contacted. This is a perfect example where RMC Staff will have to contact the city to ask for compelling evidence of a willing seller letter, via a letter of intent or option. If the city is unable to provide such documents, then the application will not be recommended for funding.

This type of evaluation of the strength of each grant proposal by RMC Staff is consistent with previous Tier 1 adopted criteria, which states:

Tier 1 projects are those ready for immediate implementation that meet the following criteria:

1. *Acquisition/development projects that add NEW acreage for open space or develops NEW areas for recreational uses, and habitat creation/restoration projects that will result in NEW habitat opportunities or preservation of "threatened" habitat*
2. *For acquisition projects, compelling evidence of a willing seller (e.g., via a letter of intent or option)*

3. *For development or restoration projects, compelling evidence that land tenure and all necessary permits are secured*
4. *Verifiable evidence that the project has sufficient funding resources such that the RMC grant will complete the funding package and allow immediate project implementation*

See the attached Exhibit 1-Project Evaluation Criteria and Exhibit 2- RMC Prop. 1 Evaluation Teams.

LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY AND RMC ADOPTED POLICIES/AUTHORITIES: The Rivers and Mountains Conservancy (RMC) statute provides in part that:

Section 32602: There is in the Resources Agency, the San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy, which is created as a state agency for the following purposes:

- (a) To acquire and manage public lands within the Lower Los Angeles River and San Gabriel River watersheds, and to provide open-space, low-impact recreational and educational uses, water conservation, watershed improvement, wildlife and habitat restoration and protection, and watershed improvement within the territory.
- (b) To preserve the San Gabriel River and the Lower Los Angeles River consistent with existing and adopted river and flood control projects for the protection of life and property.
- (c) To acquire open-space lands within the territory of the conservancy.

Section 32604: The conservancy shall do all of the following:

- (a) Establish policies and priorities for the conservancy regarding the San Gabriel River and the Lower Los Angeles River, and their watersheds, and conduct any necessary planning activities, in accordance with the purposes set forth in Section 32602.
- (b) Approve conservancy funded projects that advance the policies and priorities set forth in Section 32602.
- (d) To provide for the public's enjoyment and enhancement of recreational and educational experiences on public lands in the San Gabriel Watershed and Lower Los Angeles River, and the San Gabriel Mountains in a manner consistent with the protection of lands and resources in those watersheds.

Section 32614: The conservancy may do all of the following:

- (b) Enter into contracts with any public agency, private entity, or person necessary for the proper discharge of the conservancy's duties, and enter into a joint powers agreement with a public agency, in furtherance of the purposes set forth in Section 32602.
- (e) Enter into any other agreement with any public agency, private entity, or person necessary for the proper discharge of the conservancy's duties for the purposes set forth in Section 32602.
- (f) Recruit and coordinate volunteers and experts to conduct interpretive and recreational programs and assist with construction projects and the maintenance of parkway facilities.

Further, Section 32614 provides that: The conservancy may do all of the following:

- (g) Undertake, within the territory, site improvement projects, regulate public access, and revegetate and otherwise rehabilitate degraded areas, in consultation with any other public agency with appropriate jurisdiction and expertise, in accordance with the purposes set forth in Section 32602. The conservancy may also, within the territory, upgrade deteriorating facilities and construct new facilities as needed for outdoor recreation, nature appreciation and interpretation, and natural resources projection. The conservancy may undertake those projects by itself or in conjunction with another local agency; however, the conservancy shall provide overall coordination of those projects by setting priorities for the projects and by ensuring a uniform approach to projects. The conservancy may undertake those projects with prior notification to the legislative body of the local agency that has jurisdiction in the area in which the conservancy proposes to undertake that activity.

Section 32614.5:

- (a) The conservancy may award grants to local public agencies, state agencies, federal agencies, and nonprofit organizations for the purposes of this division.
- (b) Grants to nonprofit organizations for the acquisition of real property or interests in real property shall be subject to all of the following conditions:
 - (1) The purchase price of any interest in land acquired by the nonprofit organization may not exceed fair market value as established by an appraisal approved by the conservancy.
 - (2) The conservancy approves the terms under which the interest in land is acquired.
 - (3) The interest in land acquired pursuant to a grant from the conservancy may not be used as security for any debt incurred by the nonprofit organization unless the conservancy approves the transaction.
 - (4) The transfer of land acquired pursuant to a grant shall be subject to the approval of the conservancy and the execution of an agreement between the conservancy and the transferee sufficient to protect the interests of the state.
 - (5) The state shall have a right of entry and power of termination in and over all interests in real property acquired with state funds, which may be exercised if any essential term or condition of the grant is violated.
 - (6) If the existence of the nonprofit organization is terminated for any reason, title to all interest in real property acquired with state funds shall immediately vest in the state, except that, prior to that termination, another public agency or nonprofit organization may receive title to all or a portion of that interest in real property, by recording its acceptance of title, together with the conservancy's approval, in writing.
- (c) Any deed or other instrument of conveyance whereby real property is acquired by a nonprofit organization pursuant to this section shall be recorded and shall set forth the executor interest or right of entry on the part of the state.

RMC Resolution 2015-19 approved guidelines consistent with the Proposition 1 bond language.

Project:

Program Area:

Criteria	Urban Land	Rivers / Tributaries	Mountains / Hills	Score
1. Restore River Parkways				
1.1. The project is identified in an existing or proposed trail plan (e.g. Master Bikeway Path Plan) or connects communities to major existing or planned trails or open space.	5	5	5	
1.2. Restore River Parkway, Section 79732 (a)(3) California River Parkways Act of 2004.	1	1	1	
1.3. Project is on land that is an underutilized public or private holding. Underutilized properties include blighted vacant lots or inaccessible public lands.	1	1	1	
1.4. The project is within ¼ mile or 10 minutes walking distance of a residential area and/or public transportation and includes multilingual wayfinding signage.	1	1	1	
1.5. The project includes improvements to a pedestrian, equestrian and/or bicycle connection to an existing trail, trail system, community facility, recreation area or school.	1	1	1	
1.6. The project would accommodate a new trail into an inaccessible area.	1	1	1	
Subtotal	10	10	10	
2. Educational/ Interpretive Signage				
2.1. Educational/Interpretive and/or informational elements are included.	1	1	1	
2.2. *Signage or educational/interpretive message includes the natural history, cultural history, and watershed stewardship. (not included in criteria)	1	1	1	
Subtotal	2	2	2	
2. Habitat and Restoration Resource Values				
3.1. The project results in new habitat and increases at least one of the following: terrestrial, avian, or aquatic habitats or creates new linkages or corridors. – OR –	5	5	5	
3.2. The project preserves threatened natural habitat and protects native floral and faunal biodiversity that may be lost to a planned development.–				
OR –				
3.3. The project preserves and/or enhances existing natural habitat and protects native flora and fauna biodiversity.				
3.4. The project includes an evaluation of the suitability, strategy, and success measures for the site's habitat preservation, creation, and/or enhancement.	1	2	1	
3.5. The project supports substantial in-stream or native riparian habitat and/or supports substantial upland native vegetative cover.	1	2	1	
3.6. The project supports unique and/or irreplaceable ecological systems, i.e., coastal salt marsh, vernal pool, monarch breeding, migratory watering area.	1	2	1	
3.7. The project is located within a county-designated ecologically sensitive watershed area, i.e., Significant Ecological Area, Conceptual Area Protection Plan (CAPP), or other agency reviewed plan area.	1	2	1	
3.8. The project provides for contiguous open space and is adjacent to publicly owned space or private land protected under a conservation easement or similar perpetual restriction. The project includes habitat that provides a buffer between protected or proposed protected areas and incompatible uses.	1	2	1	
3.9. The project will be managed in such a manner as to provide maximum long term habitat protection and has an established long-term maintenance plan.	1	2	1	
3.10. The project enhances wetland and subtidal habitats to restore ecosystem function and provide multi-beneficial flood protection and resilient shorelines.	1	2	1	
3.11. The project is on the Southern California Wetlands Recovery Project Regional Strategy project list.	1	2	1	

3.12. The project design is resilient and adaptable to climate change. In addition, the project is compliant with the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32) and subsequent policy and program implementation in order to meet the State's Climate Change Adaptation and Greenhouse Gas Reductions.	1	2	1	
3.13. The scope of habitat restoration does not negatively impact the health of already existing natural habitat on site or adjacent to the site.	1	2	1	
Subtotal	15	25	15	
4. Matching Funds				
4.1. Project sponsor will contribute 100% or more matching funds (does not include in-kind services; can be other grants/gifts or private and local funding); OR	7	7	7	
4.2. Project sponsor will contribute 50% or more matching funds (does not include in-kind services; can be other grants/gifts or private and local funding); OR	5	5	5	
4.3. Contribution of matching funds will count towards completion of the entire project being submitted for funding	3	3	3	
Subtotal	7	7	7	
5. Environmental Justice and Disadvantaged Communities				
5.1. Cal-Enviro Screen standards- http://oehha.ca.gov/ej/ces2.html Up to 15 bonus points will be awarded to proposed projects that primarily benefit communities with high pollution burdens and/or high population characteristic scores, based on CalEnviroScreen maps. If your project area is not included in the Cal-Enviro maps, then include in the project narrative, the data and analysis utilized for evaluating the pollution burden and it is also the best available science. 5 points = CalEnviro Screen score of 61% -70% (on any of the 3 maps) 10 points = CalEnviroScreen Score of 71% -80% (on any of the 3 maps); 15 points = CalEnviroScreen score of 81% or higher (on any of the 3 maps)	15	15	15	
5.2. The project creates a sense of community through educational outreach, community activities, and programs.	2	1	1	
5.3. The project concept and designs are a result of direct community input held through community meetings within the vicinity of where project is located, and occurred no earlier than January 2013.	3	3	3	
5.4. The project will serve an area that has a significant percentage of residents living with chronic diseases (examples: diabetes, obesity, asthma) please visit http://oehha.ca.gov/ej/ces2.html .	2	1	1	
5.5. The project contains signage elements that promote physical activity and "healthy living" practices such as mileage markers, walking trails and other physical activities.	2	1	1	
5.6. Creates new park space in a disadvantaged or park poor community defined as a census tract with a population that has more than 30% youth and less than 80% of the state's annual median income and/or having less than 2 acres/0.8 hectares of open space per 1,000 residents. As defined by subdivision (a) of Section 79505, please visit hppt://oehha.ca.gov/ej/ces2.html .	5	5	5	
5.7. The project design and/or location provides relief from the negative impacts of urban density such as incompatible land uses and unregulated industrial impacts.	2	1	1	
5.8. The project provides physical linkages to open space (Passive and recreational) from a disadvantaged and/or park-poor neighborhood.	2	1	1	
5.9. The project conforms to the RMC Environmental Justice Policy per Section 2.4	5	5	5	
Subtotal	38	33	33	
6. Multi-benefit and multi-jurisdictional				
6.1. This project is a multi-benefit and multi-jurisdictional ecosystem and watershed protection project in accordance with statewide priorities. Multi-benefit = Achieves more than one water related element. Ex: water recycling AND trail use, water infrastructure AND sustainability, etc. Multi-jurisdictional = Partnership with more than one city, or includes more than one watershed, or is a partnership between one or more counties.	3	3	3	
Subtotal	3	3	3	

7.0 Stakeholders/Partners Resource Value

7.1. The project is clearly defined and includes an objective, mission and purpose.	1	1	1	
7.2. This project is significant to one or more local citizen groups or non-governmental organizations as evidenced by a letter of support from the organization's governing body. 3 letters or more must be submitted for point.	1	1	1	
7.3. The project promotes and implements the California Water Action Plan objectives which include reliable water supplies, the restoration of important species and habitat and a more resilient and sustainably managed water infrastructure.	1	1	1	
7.4 Projects will use the California Conservation Corps for project implementation (whole or partial) or look to hire youth through certified Youth Employment Program in coordination with the State/County or qualified non-governmental organization (NGO).	5	5	5	
Subtotal	8	8	8	

8. Stewardship and Management Plan Value

8.1. The project includes an adopted guidelines, strategic plan, etc. for active stakeholder/partner participation that includes the 20-25 year period of the project after completion (includes identification of stakeholder/partner groups).	1	1	1	
8.2. The project includes a landscape maintenance manual containing details regarding logistics of weed management, trail maintenance, trash management, unauthorized uses, and a habitat establishment monitoring program.	1	1	1	
8.3. The project identifies funding for a specified list of activities, that an organization (i.e. professional contractor, local non-profit, or community volunteer group) with relevant expertise, that will provide appropriate future stewardship and adaptive management to ensure the sustainability of the project.	1	1	1	
8.4. Applicant has organizational capacity and has 10+ years of maintaining and operating projects of similar size and scope.	1	1	1	
Subtotal	4	4	4	

9. Water Sustainability/Water Storage/Water Infrastructure

9.1. The project includes 3 or more of the following elements to address climate change: 1) Sustainable site planning and land use compatibility 2) Safeguarding water and water efficiency, 3) Energy efficiency and renewable energy, 4) Conservation of materials and resources, and 5) Indoor environmental quality.	5	5	5	
9.2. The project incorporates more than 50% recycled content product hardscape elements (benches, signage, light fixtures, gates, fences, etc.,)	1	1	1	
9.3. The project maintains a more than a 75% native plant palette.	1	1	1	
9.4. The project Maintains and improve flood protection through natural and non-structural systems and ecosystem restoration.	1	1	1	
9.5. Establish riverfront greenways to cleanse water, hold floodwaters and extend open space.	1	1	1	
9.6. Optimize water resources by improving the quality of surface and ground water and enhance ground water recharge, to reduce dependence on imported water.	1	1	1	
Subtotal	10	10	10	

10. Urban Land Value

10.1 The project contributes to the removal of a nuisance property/use from the community.	2	1	1	
10.2 The project provides relief from high urban density defined as 150% or more of county median population density	2	1	1	
10.3 The project contributes to an existing or proposed park, natural area, corridor, or greenway in an urbanized area.	2	1	1	
10.4 The project involves joint-use of a site (e.g. a school yard, is a public park during off-school hours).	2	1	1	
14.9. The project is sited in an area with more than 120% of the median county percent under age 18.	2	1	1	
Subtotal	10	5	5	

11. Water Resource and Quality Value				
11.1. The project provides a new opportunity for substantial water conservation and/or water quality improvements	5	5	5	
11.2. The project contains or improves groundwater supply and/or recharge capabilities.	5	5	5	
11.3. Project includes treatment of storm water runoff.	4	4	4	
11.4. The project includes a groundwater improvement element that exceeds the recommended elements of the Comprehensive Groundwater Quality Monitoring Act of 2001.	1	1	1	
11.5. The project utilizes recycled water.	1	1	1	
11.6. The project utilizes cisterns or similar devices to collect and recycle rainwater on site. Project includes water conservation measures.	1	1	1	
11.7. The project includes a water quality element consistent with the description of a "small or neighborhood project" as described in the Greater Los Angeles Region IRWM Plan.	3	3	3	3
11.8. The project includes a water quality element consistent with the description of a "medium or sub watershed project" as described in the Greater Los Angeles Region IRWM Plan.	2	2	2	X
11.9. The project includes a water quality element consistent with the description of a "large or multi sub watershed project" as described in the Greater Los Angeles Region IRWM Plan.	1	1	1	X
11.10 The project is part of a Watershed Management Plan or Enhanced Watershed Management Plan within Greater LA County	2	2	2	
Subtotal	25	25	25	
TOTAL Score				
TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS	133	133	123	

Exhibit 2- RMC Prop. 1 Evaluation Teams

Name	Organization	TEAM ASSIGNED TO JOSE: LUZ: MARYBETH	ATTENDED TRAINING SESSION
Jose Gardea			
Meredith McCarthy	Heal the Bay	JOSE	X
Frank O'Brien	Harbor Watts EDC	JOSE	X
Alina Bokde	Los Angeles Neighborhood Land Trust	JOSE	X
Larry Kaplan	Consultant	JOSE	
Luz Quinnell			
Elizabeth Lambe	Los Cerritos Wetlands Trust for Long Beach and Seal Beach	LUZ	X
Christine Whitcraft	CSULB	LUZ	X
Andrea Gullo	Puente Hills Habitat Authority	LUZ	X
Grace Chan	The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	LUZ	
Marybeth Vergara			
Raphael Mazor	Southern California Coastal Water Research Project	MARYBETH	X
Pauline Louie	Urban Waters LA River Watershed Ambassador	MARYBETH	X
Shona Ganguly	Nature Conservancy	MARYBETH	X
Rob Romanek	WCA	MARYBETH	x