



Disadvantaged Community Ranking Criteria

This page intentionally left blank.

DAC Criteria FINAL

Disadvantaged Community Ranking Criteria for the Greater Los Angeles County Integrated Regional Watershed Management Plan

Prepared by: GLAC DAC Committee

The Disadvantaged Community (DAC) Committee developed the following criteria to identify and rank the existing DAC projects in the LA IRWMP OPTI database and as recommended by each sub-regional Steering Committees for Round 2 projects. Projects are being evaluated on local priorities in the spirit of legislation chaptered under AB 626 (Eng) which indicates that 10% of specified funds appropriated to the Department of Water Resources be allocated to “facilitate and support the participation of disadvantaged communities in integrated regional water management planning and for projects that address critical water supply or water quality needs for disadvantaged communities”.¹

These criteria will be used by the DAC committee to support the DAC designation of particular projects and to provide recommendations to the Leadership Committee of what proposed DAC projects are best aligned with the local priorities of the urban DAC found within GLAC-IRWM region.

A Disadvantaged Community is defined as a community with an annual median household income that is less than 80% of the Statewide annual median household income. Currently the State of California’s MHI is \$60,883².

¹ AB 626, Eng. Bond revenues: Integrated regional water management: grants. Chaptered October 11, 2009.

² US Census Bureau, 2006-10 Estimates (<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/06/06037.html>.) 80% = \$48,706. Los Angeles County has MHI of \$55,476, with over 15% of those households living in poverty.

DAC Criteria FINAL

Criteria

Project Factors	Points	Comments
1. Is the project in a DAC census area or does the project provide direct benefits to an identified DAC census area?	Pass/Fail	
2. Does this project improve a water-related condition for the identified DAC? Please describe the type of benefits to the DAC. Refer to IRWM Guidelines, Table 9, pg. 87 DAC Project Examples	4pts	
3. Has the proponent had meaningful engagement with members of the DAC during project scoping? Meaningful engagement means community member input was consistent with the purpose of the project or influenced the identification and selection of the project.	1pt	
4. Does the project proponent have documented support from members of the DAC that will benefit from the proposed improvements or project planning or implementation? Examples of this can be letters of support from NGO's, residents, or other civic groups different from the proponent. If letters are not available, describe your engagement process.	2pts	
5. Has the proponent planned for meaningful engagement with members of the DAC during project implementation? Meaningful engagement means community members will provide input about the project as appropriate. Describe your engagement plan.	2 pts	
TOTAL POINTS	9	