SAFE, CLEAN WATER PROGRAM
Governance Subcommittee

Meeting Summary: February 8, 2018

MEETING IN BRIEF

This was the first meeting of the Governance Subcommittee for the Safe, Clean Water Program. The objectives of the meeting were to:

1. Provide overview of the Governance Subcommittee purpose and roles
2. Discuss and gather feedback on how Governance can best meet the objectives of the Safe, Clean Water Program

Attendees

Marty Adams	Alberto Grajeda	Dave Pedersen
Joe Bellomo	Bill Johnson	Rachel Roque
Carl Blum	Leslie Johnson	Hannah Sans
Daniel Bradbury	Mike Lewis	Jess Talamantes
Russ Bryden	Mark Lombos	Melissa Turcotte
Liz Crosson	Marsha McLean	Edel Vizcarra
Ken Farfsing	TJ Moon	Robb Whittaker
Matt Frary	Judy Nelson	Katy Young
Kelly Gardner	Rochelle Paras	

Agenda:
Welcome

The goal for the meeting is to conduct listening sessions for County staff and leadership to gather ideas and explore thought lines for Program Content with stakeholders. These meetings also allow for interested parties to hear each other, to better understand each other, and develop a more meaningful and impactful Program, together. These meetings are not meant to achieve consensus.

Review of Board of Supervisors' Purpose and Intent for the Safe, Clean Water Program

The objectives and outcome of the Safe, Clean Water Program were reviewed.

Review Water Resources Management in Los Angeles County

Please refer to the presentation handout for Governance

Discussion

What do we want the Regional Program to achieve?

Comments received include:

- Suggestion that the Governance structure account for auditing and tracking of funds to ensure that selected projects and programs accomplish what was intended.
- Discussion fairness in terms of how funding is distributed and how fairness and equity are not necessarily the same. Members also stated that cities that generate the most revenue would receive more funding.
- Suggestion that Governance be structured by sub-watershed but also include an overarching governing group. Members also suggested that the San Gabriel COG may be suited to be the governing body for the region but that may not be true for other COGs in the County.
- Suggestion that projects be overseen by a local governing group.
- Flexibility identified as a key element for governance structure.
- Suggestion that governance be structured by watershed, similar to IRWMP, as proportional distribution has worked well and the watershed approach would provide the best value regionally.
- Suggestion that unique local challenges should be considered by considering different sub-regional representation depending on project proponent or area.
- Suggestion that FCD consider an overarching group in the governance structure. Or consider tiers of governance to accommodate both technical and political aspects of the Program. Technical reviews can happen at the watershed level and political considerations can be made by a separate oversight body.
- Suggestion that it makes sense to look at E/WMPs as a starting point, but the membership size, number of E/WMPs, membership representation is of concern.

What should the governance structure look like and what are appropriate boundaries for sub-regions?

Comments received include:

- Suggestion that the Program have multiple governance structures, an overarching body (possibly Board appointees) as well as regional input.
- Note that FCD has done a good job in its leadership role with IRWMP. IRWMP is a good model to look at as a starting point
- Concern that some E/WMP memberships are too large and unmanageable. Major watersheds are big and potentially difficult to manage as well.
- Suggestion that FCD consider overlaying E/WMP boundaries with IRWMP's sub-regions to create more than 5 sub-regions.

How should Regional governance select projects for funding?

Comments received include:

- Suggestion that minimum project criteria be considered. Scoring could provide eligible projects for consideration where all projects are treated as equally viable. Projects could then be selected based on which are most ready for implementation.
- Suggestion that there be flexibility in the Program to revisit project selection criteria every 5-10 years, as technology will change making different types of projects more viable.
- Note that METRO is a good example in that points are given for a significant local match. It was suggested that the Program allow a group of cities to collaboratively provide a local match since this will better enable smaller cities to submit regional projects.
- Suggestion that FCD consider rolling applications for the Program as opposed to annual opportunities to submit projects.
- Suggestion that the administration of funding is one of most important functions of the governing body and project selection is the means by which funding is administered. Technical groups could feed into the administering committee.
- Suggestion that governance is not about implementation and that projects be implemented at the local level due to the familiarity with communities. Audit function is important too.
- Suggestion that the purpose of governance is to accept project scores and move projects forward, like a clearinghouse.
- Suggestion that FCD consider that projects with no other funding source be part of this Program. Projects intended to meet compliance may not necessary have a good cost-benefit ratio.

How should existing planning efforts fit into this Program?

Comments received include:

- Suggestion that the Governance structure not call for the creation of new plans, but instead make sure that projects are consistent with existing plans.
- Suggestion that FCD consider the flexibility to add elements to provide additional benefits to projects in existing plans.
- Suggestion that the Program take advantage of what has already been done in terms of planning and instead focus on delivering projects.
- Suggestion that FCD score E/WMPs and IRWMP projects in the Program selection criteria to help set thresholds for this Program.
- Suggestion that FCD explore methods to include projects that are not in existing plans such as NGO & CBO projects. It was noted that IRWMP has a process for including additional projects from NGOs and CBOs. They can submit projects through this process to be added to IRWMP, and the project is only required to meet the goals of IRWMP.
- Suggestion that this Program use the existing IRWMP structure, but supplement the existing plans to address this Program's outcomes. Some caution that if this Program does not use the IRWMP structure, it would be doing redundant work. Note that IRWMP has been developed over many years and that IRWMP groups have established trust

and working relationships. There was recognition among the group that IRWMP group membership will need to be tweaked in order to meet this Program's goals.

With the Program Outcomes in mind, who should make up the membership of the Regional Program's governance?

Comments received include:

- Suggestion to keep as much of the IRWMP membership as possible, so as to keep the same group dynamics, but that consideration needs to be taken to make sure there is fair representation within those groups.
- Note that IRWMP membership does not have good representation from the business sector, NGOs, COGs, or Cities (except for some supply-related city representatives). Members suggest that the governance for this Program fill these voids in IRWMP's structure.
- Suggestion that municipalities that are most impacted (geographically) be represented in the governance structure.

Next Steps

- Look more closely at GLAC IRWM selection process, planning document, membership, construction, list of projects and costs, how it evolved (e.g. changes related to Gateway cities), and management areas.

- Look at EWMP groups to see how we can logically split up the larger IRWMP sub-regions.

Public Comment

None

Closing Remarks

Mr. Vizcarra thanked all members for their participation and noted that any written comments can be submitted via www.safecleanwaterla.org or sent to Russ Bryden (rbryden@dpw.lacounty.gov) or Alberto Grajeda (algrajeda@dpw.lacounty.gov).

Adjourn

Mr. Vizcarra adjourned the meeting.