SAFE, CLEAN WATER PROGRAM
Governance Subcommittee

Meeting Summary: March 8, 2018

MEETING IN BRIEF

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

1. Analyze existing IRWM governance structures
2. Analyze geographic boundaries
3. Review the Regional Program Project Selection Process
4. Discuss whether a two-tier or one-tier governance structure can better accomplish a balance of Program outcomes
5. Analyze membership (e.g. agency, non-agency, NGO's, other) in governance

Attendees

Dave Pedersen
Kelly Gardner
Mike Lewis
Belinda Faustinos
Diana Mahmud
Judy Nelson
Eric Wolf
Jess Talamantes
Carl Blum
Marty Adams
Liz Crosson
Barbara Romero

Agenda:

Welcome

The meeting began with opening remarks and a brief introduction from the subcommittee participants

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

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

Summary of Other Subcommittee Discussions

Meeting facilitators summarized the discussion topics of the Credits/Rebates & Incentives, Project Selection Criteria, and DAC's, Equity, and Stakeholder Involvement Subcommittee's.

Review February 8th Subcommittee Summary Notes

Mr. Russ Bryden reviewed the subcommittee discussion summary of the February 8th, 2018 meeting.

Gather Feedback on Governance

IRWM (membership, project selection model, planning, projects & costs)

- Members expressed concern about the IRWM elected/agency officials membership.
- IRWM continues to expand and change to include more representation and participation.

Discuss Strawman Proposal (Analyze Geographic Boundaries)

- Suggestion to reorganize boundary of the Upper Los Angeles River Watershed, such that 10 cities in the SGVCOG form their own watershed group. Important to know how funding will be distributed given that many cities are in more than one watershed group.
- Members agree to keep EWMP boundaries whole, where applicable. Boundaries should be established based on watershed/hydrological area.

Discuss Strawman Proposal (Review the Regional Program Project Selection Process)

- Members questioned whether a technical committee will be established for each watershed group, or one centralized group.
    - Proposed having a centralized technical scoring committee so that projects are scored uniformly.
- Members expressed concern with technical committee. Suggested standardizing scoring criteria.
    - Possible to have technical committee review instead of initial scoring
    - Important to discuss the distribution of funds
    - Technical committee will likely determine cut score, then watershed groups will select projects from those that are eligible
- Suggestion to have technical assistance up front to help small cities and NGO's ready to submit feasible projects in the system/process.
- Suggestion for small pot of funds up front for technical assistance is needed to assure feasible projects move forward.
- Suggestion for schools, parks, open space participation as potential members
- Suggestion for the watershed group to provide conceptual approval at a minimum. Seed funding.
- Suggestion for projects to be part of an existing plan to be eligible for funding.
- Consider who will be competing for funds. Cities and COG's will be in need of funding for compliance purposes.

- Recommend funding distribution consider population, rather that revenue generated
- Question on tax methodology – area or value of property?
    - Two tax methodology's are being explored
- Recommend distribution of funding by population. This will benefit DAC's.
- Recommend proposed DAC definition by income.
- Suggestion <4% of median DAC income should go towards water.

One-Tier vs Two-Tier Governance Structure

- Concerns from members that two-tier governance presents an opportunity to introduce politics.
- Members suggest that one-tier governance is preferable. Regional projects should be funded by FCD 10%.
- Suggestion to consider two-tier because RCC would fill in gaps for water quality or equity.
- Suggestion for one-tier governance. SGV will not be at disadvantage.

Analyze Membership

- Suggestion from committee member to include schools, parks, and non-government open space groups into membership. Nomination process.
- Suggestion for cities to weigh in based on knowledge of hydrology.
- Suggest for personnel to specify skills in categories (e.g. construction, water, design, engineering, etc.). Any qualified representative.
- Committee member opposes inclusion of schools until they obtain MS4 permit obligations. Most school districts do not have the expertise to serve on committees. Parks/open space should suffice as the representation.
- Committee member mentioned not all proposed representatives are permittees. Many schools are constructed along river systems and offer great opportunity.
- Committee members support city representative governance structure.
- Committee members expressed concern with how wastewater and water agencies are outnumbered.
- Consider proportional representation for larger cities.
- Committee member agrees with each city having representation. Consider adding a seat for COG for regional perspective.
- Committee member mentioned the RCC will highlight disadvantage to smaller city in Upper LA.
- Suggestion to include O&M pot. Some programs could be funded by FCD 10%.
- Consider matching funds for cities.
- Committee member disagrees with sub pots.
- Committee member prefer cap on spending. Consider construction authority for projects so that they are built and maintained in standardized manner.

Next Steps

- Date for next subcommittee meeting is TBD. Attempt to present a proposal for next subcommittee meeting.

Public Comment

- Support school board membership on watershed groups and RCC. Schools are scheduled to be added as permittees. School representatives serve on regional and local levels. Education is important. Many school board members have expertise/background in environmental/water issues.

Closing Remarks

Facilitators thanked all members and attendees for their participation

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

Meeting Adjourned