



Los Angeles County Nature-based Solutions Task Force Phase 2 Meeting 1 – Summary

Meeting Details

Date: Tuesday, February 10, 2026

Time: 11:00-2:00 p.m.

Location: Public Works Building, 900 S Fremont Ave, Alhambra, CA 91803, Room C

Meeting Objectives

1. Establish desired outcome for Phase 2
2. Learn about existing metrics + how Task Force deliverables will be continued by County
3. Iterate on the Phase 2 Process

Attendees Panel Members:

Andrea Vona (Department of Parks and Recreation)

Rowan Roderick-Jones (Stillwater Sciences)

Rebecca Kaliff (LA County Subcontract/Ultieg)

Gabriel Mason (LA County DPW)

Gary Lai (Quixotic Nature-based Solutions)

Craig Doberstein (Herrera)

Igor Bronz (Tree People)

Tim Brick (Arroyo Seco Foundation)

Bruce Hamamoto (LA County DPW)

Melina Watts (Watershed Coordinator)

Claudia Arrends (Forest Service)

Rachel Maralich (City Forest Officer)

Rebecca Ferdman (CSO)

Candice (FOLAR)

Amanda Begley (TreePeople)

Maggie Gardner (LA Waterkeeper)

Hayat Rasul (Statec)

Alonso Garcia (Council for Watershed Health)

County Team:

Jason Pepito (LA County DPW)

Justin Jones (LA County DPW)

James Carpenter (LA County DPW)

Jackie Ly (LA County DPW)

LA COUNTY WATER PLAN

Yao Kouwonou (LA County DPW)

Lee Alexanderson (LA County DPW)

Panel Facilitation Support Team:

Eileen Aldunda (Council for Watershed Health)

Tanishka Chellani (Council for Watershed Health)

Jason Casanova (Council for Watershed Health)

Todd Whitney (Council for Watershed Health)

Agenda Item	Notes:
Welcome	<p>Eileen Aldunda started the meeting sharing out the conception of the NbS Task Force and summarizing the goal of NbS and a useful framing: NbS for the short term and the next 5, 15, 100 years, etc.</p> <p>EA Shared the work that has been done and presented key takeaways from the CNRA NbS Summit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Starting with soil health, that laid the foundation. ● Economic value, keep in mind, commercial and avoidant costs. ● Agriculture example, bio dynamics, schoolyards greening, asphalt to greening and cooling. <p>Introductions: Tanishka Chellani started with introductions, then presented the Phase 2 purpose, Nature-based Solutions definitions from Phase 1, the Nature-based Solutions Standard, the Phase 1 criteria, and Phase 1 metrics from the packets, along with additional metric categories.</p>
NbS Task Force: Introducing Phase 2	<p>Introduction to County Subcontractors, Justin Jones, and an update that LA county will release Watershed Plans soon. <i>Questions - none</i></p> <p>Rebecca Kalliff introduced themselves, sharing their role in Paradigm supporting LA Public Works and LA County for Watershed Plans. Paradigm team will be present to listen in and help integrate into Watershed pLan efforts.</p> <p>PW Teams walked through Exiting Metrics in the Watershed Plans. Indicated placeholder for recommendations made by the NbS Task Force.</p>

	<p><i>Question: Are all the other metrics fixed or open to be revised?</i> <i>Justin Jones: They are fixed for the time being, Justin Jones mentioned being willing to meet to discuss off line.</i></p> <p><i>Question: Developing metrics is challenging as NbS Projects don't make it through. We are asking how something is measured when we don't have the opportunity to track it, presenting a kind of chicken and egg scenario.</i></p> <p><i>Question: What is the timing for the eligibility/scoring framework, has the work already begun?</i> <i>Answer (County): Most of the work has started and the metrics will be considered in the scoring revision.</i></p> <p><i>Comment: Restoration was once overall planning before planning, project fish passage, look at the whole system is needed before planning an individual project. This should be reflected in the NbS processes + assessments.</i> <i>Answer: The team working on the watershed plans is looking at impacts the overall program, and how other projects will fold into metrics</i></p> <p>Clarification on task: NbS Task Force is responsible for sharing 3 NbS metrics with LA county and that some of the existing metrics can be adapted or edited to roll up.</p> <p><i>Question: Why are we limited to 3 metrics? Limiting ourselves at this point is not fair.</i> <i>Answer: 3 metrics to start with because of the quantity of other metrics included in the Watershed Plans. However, County teams are open to taking into account as it changes.</i> <i>TC: We can provide additional metrics and pass on to the County as they will roll them up as they see fit.</i></p> <p><i>Question: Are we trying to look for eligibility requirements? And how do we score future planning? So are the metrics and the scoring/eligibility framework parallel tracks/ two separate outcomes?</i> <i>Answer: These efforts are separate efforts.</i></p> <p><i>Question: How will the metrics then be considered as part of the eligibility and scoring changes. LA county effort to revive those guides is separate, and would feed into considerations of future plans.</i></p> <p><i>Additionally similar questions: How much power will TF NbS</i></p>
--	--

LA COUNTY WATER PLAN

	<p><i>recommendations have? With the group expressing that it will be hard to come up with metrics without implementation for the next step.</i></p> <p>TC closed this piece of the conversation sharing that the process is crucial as it will help lead to the outcome.</p> <p>TC if we establish metrics that meet the criteria, then we implicitly meet the Standard and Definition of NbS.</p> <p>15 min break.</p>
<p>NbS Task Force Phase 2 Challenge Framing (CWH)</p>	<p>TC showed a Challenge Framing slide and summarized QA the group had in the previous agenda item.</p> <p>Summary: Metrics and eligibility are parallel processes, recommendations made in the Task Force will affect other processes and it is useful to discuss them if the group wants to set that as a priority.</p> <p>TC shared that CWH team is open to adjusting the process of how we get to the metrics.</p> <p>Why metrics matter slide <i>Comment: Metrics must be measurable.</i></p> <p>TC goes through packette, what does a project need to demonstrate for NbS <i>Comment: The Task Force should set aside time to discuss measuring the longevity of the project, and how measurement/metrics may be related.</i></p> <p>TC presented the rest of the handouts, no questions.</p>
<p>Breakout Groups Share out</p>	<p>Breakout Groups to discuss the process and review additional metrics recommended in the Metrics section of the NbS Recommendations Report. Broke into three groups: 1,2,3</p> <p><i>Group 1: Discussion focused on the potential adoption of metrics by LA County and the need for them to be dynamic, rather than functioning as a simple check-the-box requirement. Participants questioned how serious the County is about adopting these metrics and whether there is sufficient appetite for implementation. The group also discussed connecting individual projects to larger watershed goals, including the watershed plan. Tree canopy was raised in relation to addressing excess heat, with the percentage of</i></p>

	<p><i>canopy suggested as a possible metric. There was also discussion about the level of expertise required and the involvement of different disciplines.</i></p> <p><i>Group 2: Although the meeting was intended to develop a new scoring system, participants emphasized the importance of considering the entire watershed, noting that upstream and downstream projects are often not well connected. There was a suggestion to improve coordination across the watershed, though tracking across the county is challenging. Questions were raised about what qualifies as a Nature-based Solution (NbS). Water capture was identified as a priority, and participants suggested a different scoring approach for certain projects. One suggestion was to obtain letters from landowners before starting a project.</i></p> <p><i>Group 3: Participants noted that risk tolerance is not currently considered in the metrics. They also discussed how eligibility and project variability are difficult to capture in fixed metrics. Regional goals may change, and determining the appropriate level of nature-based elements for large versus small sites can be challenging. There was also discussion about defining nature in terms of ecological processes and living systems, and whether this could be incorporated into the metrics.</i></p> <p><i>Comment: Clarification is needed regarding metrics for the watershed plan versus individual projects. We should establish the minimum threshold for a project to be considered NbS (e.g., whether it incorporates natural processes), as well as define criteria along a spectrum, from lower to higher alignment with NbS principles. This would help distinguish what qualifies as meeting the minimum bar versus what represents stronger performance and merits additional points in project evaluation.</i></p>
<p>CNRA NbS Summit + Closing</p> <p>Share update for Task Force Phase 2 Meeting 2</p>	<p>TC recapped: LA County has demonstrated an appetite for this work, which is why the Task Force was created, and these issues will be addressed through related processes. This is intended to be a parallel process—there will not be a separate task force, but rather the same team developing recommendations for scoring and eligibility. County representatives are present, listening, and the appropriate staff are participating in the meetings.</p> <p>The metrics are intended to apply to both new projects and previously developed projects that identify themselves as NbS. Consideration should be given to how achievable these metrics are in establishing a clear and practical</p>

LA COUNTY WATER PLAN

	<p>baseline for NbS.</p> <p>TC closed to conversation sharing resources from the CNRA NbS Summit including 8 NbS meetings to be held across the state.</p> <p>Shared the next meeting date: March 10, 2026. Prior to the following meeting Task Force participants will be asked to review the 52 Watershed Plan metrics and the additional metrics recommended in the NbS Task Force report as the basis of refining what key NbS metrics the Task Force will pass on the County.</p>
--	--