



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

### Meeting Details

Date: Tuesday, March 10, 2026

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

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

### Meeting Objectives

1. Create an expanded list of metrics for each of the NbS Criteria
2. Identify projects that meet each NbS Criteria well
3. Decide on an approach for narrowing down the expanded list of criteria

### Attendees Panel Members:

Andrea Vona (Department of Parks and Recreation)

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 (Stewards of the Arroyo Secco)

Bruce Hamamoto (LA County DPW)

Melina Watts (Watershed Coordinator)

Rachel Maralich (City Forest Officer)

Amanda Begley (TreePeople)

Maggie Gardner (LA Waterkeeper)

Hayat Rasul (DRP)

Kelsey Jessup (TNC)

Clement Lau (CSO)

Mike Antos (Stantec)

Wendy Katagi (McMillen)

Samanta MJ Yang (San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians)

Nina Raj (Altadena Seed Library)

Claire Robinson (Amigos de los Ríos)

Rowan Roderic Jones (Stillwater Sciences)

Justin Nakano (Watermaster)

# LA COUNTY WATER PLAN

## County Team:

Jason Pepito (LA County DPW)  
 Justin Jones (LA County DPW)  
 James Carpenter (LA County DPW)  
 Madai Sanchez - (LA County DPW)  
 Yao Kouwonou (LA County DPW)  
 Lee Alexanderson (LA County DPW)

## Panel Facilitation Support Team:

Eileen Alduenda (Council for Watershed Health)  
 Tanishka Chellani (Council for Watershed Health)  
 Jason Casanova (Council for Watershed Health)

Agenda Item	Notes:
1. Welcome	Tanishka Chellani started with introductions, then presented the Phase 2 purpose, Nature-based Solutions definitions from Phase 1, and the Nature-based Solutions Standard. She then reviewed the Nature-based Solutions Criteria from Phase 1, followed by Phase 1 metrics from the packets and additional metric categories.
2. Step 1: Individual Review of the Metrics by NbS Criteria	TC asked participants to review a spreadsheet of Watershed Planning and Task Force–recommended metrics organized by the four Nature-based Solutions key criteria established in Phase 1. The group was given 20 minutes to independently review and collect initial thoughts on the metrics.
3. Step 2: Break Out Groups by NbS Key Criteria + Share Out + Step 3: Expand Metric List	<p>Break out groups were formed. Participants feeling strongly about contributing to metrics for a specific criteria were given the option to do so. The rest of the group numbered off.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>Groups worked to identify an ideal project that met the groups assigned Nature-based Criteria well.</i></li> <li>● <i>Groups were asked to consider what a project demonstrates to accomplish their assigned criteria?</i></li> <li>● <i>Groups were asked to expand the list of metrics organized by criteria.</i></li> </ul> <p>Groups shared out their initial findings</p>

*Criteria 1: Biodiversity*

*To meet this criteria, the group would like to measure ecological uplift. The group established that Criteria 1 overlapped with several other Criteria and that there should be 5 components/factors measured.*

- 1. Where the project is located/context  
Focus on connectivity- reference to the Connectivity Masterplan*
- 2. Type*
- 3. Existing Site Condition + Post Project Implementation*
- 4. Alt. to site condition— Site Preservation*
- 5. Offsite Impacts*

*Ideal Projects Mentioned:*

- Fish Passage*
- Bowtie- post implementation lessons learned*

*Criteria 2: Scale*

*The group noted that a lot of the metrics for this criteria can fit within other criteria. A standout measurement included letters from adjacent projects to make sure that projects are undermining each other at the least or are, ideally, coordinated in their efforts.*

*Prioritizing the holistic Assessment of projects*

*Ideal Projects Mentioned*

- Urban Orchard*

*Criteria 3: Societal + Communal Challenges*

*Noted that community informed projects and community organizations engaged might be a good starting point for measurement. What has to be established is the societal and communal challenges specific to a project site.*

*Another group member noted that addressing community challenges does not automatically mean the project is NbS. The group clarified that it's about identifying a project and establishing community engagement, and solving that problem with an NbS.*

*Another nuance noted was that restoring land for preservation is very different from programming land for human use.*

*Ideal Project Mentioned:*

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>Oil Pumping Site Rehabilitation</i></li> <li>● <i>School Greening</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Criteria 4: Stewardship</i></p> <p><i>Identified the need to have distinct pre and post implementation metrics. Identified the need to have an established care plan, with the post implementation metrics being if that care plan was followed.</i></p> <p><i>Ideal Project:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>Eaton Canyon Recovery Center</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Restoration Plans</i></li> <li>○ <i>Curriculum for ongoing plan</i></li> <li>○ <i>Community Partners engaged thoroughly</i></li> <li>○ <i>Tribal engagement was done well</i></li> <li>○ <i>The project considered the will being of groups existing in the area after the project.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><i>Member shared that to them nature-based solutions are simply about determining if we are solving a given problem, with nature.</i></p> <p><i>Another member shared that this is a helpful view because are we just defining if a project is nature based or are we determining if they solve the problem with nature?</i></p> <p><i>Participant shared that this effort is important because we are not currently set up to support living infrastructure countywide.</i></p> <p>The groups stepped away for a 15 minute break. Following the break, groups reconvened to expand the existing list of metrics broken down by NbS Criteria.</p>
<p>4. Group Discussion</p> <p>Step 4: Report back from Breakout Group +</p> <p>Step 5: Recommendations for refining the</p>	<p>The groups shared final thoughts</p> <p><i>Criteria 1:</i></p> <p><i>A question was raised about whether these metrics are intended for monitoring or competitiveness for funding. Ecological uplift was discussed as a competitive factor, with the suggestion that there should be a list of options to demonstrate ecological uplift. Coordination with the City of Los Angeles Biodiversity Index was recommended, as it includes a strong set of metrics.</i></p>

<p>metrics list</p>	<p><i>Additional metrics mentioned included species composition, invasive species monitoring over time, percent of habitat restored, understory plant health in addition to mature plant health, heavy metal contaminants, and outplanting survival rates. Coordination with County engineering and permitting was also noted, as there is currently no guide for Nature-based Solutions plans.</i></p> <p><i>Criteria 2: Discussion focused on whether projects should be evaluated based on primary Nature-based Solutions benefits or if significant secondary benefits should also be weighted. The group emphasized the need to clarify what qualifies as a Nature-based Solutions project, noting that elements such as stewardship and connectivity may need to be standard expectations across projects.</i></p> <p><i>Criteria 3: The group discussed what effective documentation of community and societal benefits would look like. This included considering how to define meaningful community benefits and how to incorporate workforce development and job creation.</i></p> <p><i>Criteria 4: Operations and maintenance and stewardship were discussed as both a funding need and an opportunity. Workforce development would require better coordination with training programs and clearer strategies for leveraging operations and maintenance.</i></p> <p>The group decided that the list of metrics would best be narrowed down via a survey where participants can vote on their top metrics.</p>
<p>5. Discussion Request</p>	<p>TC shared the addition of a new option for meetings. NbS Task Force members could submit a discussion request for topics that are not being discussed as part of the metrics setting process but are relevant to the NbS Task Force's Phase 1 recommendations.</p> <p>TC shared slides and opened up for group discussion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● How can we better integrate Watershed Restoration into Nature-based Solutions Planning/Watershed Plans/Metrics?</li> <li>● How can smaller groups, orgs, and nonprofits with NbS expertise make it on the Technical Assistance Teams list?</li> </ul>

# LA COUNTY WATER PLAN

6. Closing	The following meeting will convene on April 7th in the Public Works building.
------------	---