



Stakeholder Advisory Committee: Program Elements Workshop Meeting Summary

April 19, 2018
10:00am-12:00pm & 1:00pm-3:00pm
Room 1514
Los Angeles Department of Water & Power
111 North Hope Street
Los Angeles, CA

Purpose:

This meeting purpose was to discuss, analyze and gather feedback for the Safe, Clean Water Draft Program Elements.

Attendees:

Adel Hagekhalil	Diana Mahmud	Kelly Gardner	Meghan Sahli-	Robb Whittaker
Belinda Faustinos	Eric Wolf	Ken Farfsing	Wells	Robert
Carl Blum	Felipe Escobar	Liz Crosson	Melissa You	Wunderlich
David Pedersen	Judy Nelson	Marsha McLean	Mike Lewis	Shane Phillips
Denise Diaz	Kelli Tunicliff	Marty Adams	Perter Herzog	Shelley Luce

Agenda:

SESSION I (10am-12pm)

1. Welcome

The meeting began with a brief introduction and overview of the Safe, Clean Water (SCW) Program. The group was reminded about the 30-day comment period, and encouraged to submit their respective comments regarding the SCW Draft Program Elements.

2. Program Updates

Leslie Friedman-Johnson, CNRG, provided an update regarding the development of the Credit, Rebate and Incentive Program. The intent is to present material regarding this program during the upcoming Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) meeting. She also provided an update to the group regarding public opinion research. A full presentation regarding the findings of that research will be shared with the group prior to the next SAC meeting.

Teresa Villegas, Los Angeles County Supervisorial District 1, provided a brief overview on the current status of the Draft Program Elements, and how certain issues have been addressed in the document, thus far. She encouraged the group to provide additional comments and feedback to help develop and refine the current version of the Draft Program Elements.

Katy Young, Los Angeles County Supervisorial District 3, reminded the group of the guiding program principles, and how the funding measure could address meaningful multi-benefit projects.



3. Program Elements

Russ Bryden, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, summarized the timeline of meetings and activities that eventually led to the development of the first draft of the Program Elements. He discussed the major themes that would be explored in the current version of the document, and began the presentation which detailed the key elements of the Municipal Program, Equity, and the Flood Control District Program. Mr. Bryden also encouraged the group to keep providing comments and feedback to further develop the Program.

Lisa Ballin, Center for Collaborative Policy, opened the discussion to the committee members. The comments received were as follows:

a. Municipal Program

- Community Investment benefit must be inclusive in all definitions. Remove “and/or” involving community investment, and replace with “and.”
- Consider flexibility with the 30% Maintenance of Effort for existing projects/programs.
- Consider flexibility in quantifying Community Investments Benefits. Must set reasonable standards/metrics for what constitutes Community Investments.
- Concerns with how funds will be used for O&M of existing projects.
- Program must support full local control. Municipalities already have a process that provides transparency.
- Consider revising the repetitive use of “engage stakeholders” on page 22, Section VII, A (a, c, k).
- Consider reducing the Maintenance of Effort percentage (30%).
- Suggestion for Municipalities to develop a selection criteria process that will promote transparency in the Municipal Program.
- Municipalities are concerned with adding scoring criteria for the Municipal Program.
- Regarding the concept of misuse of funds penalty, suggest incorporating a grace period for municipalities.
- Issue credits for homeowners who have existing stormwater BMP’s.
- Suggestion for the Program to improve civic engagement and outreach.

b. Equity/Flood Control District (District) Program

- Consider using District funds for Regional monitoring.
- Define the 110% DAC return in a monetary amount.
- Nature based solutions should apply to policy goals and all programs, not just Equity.
- Suggestion to include a displacement policy under Policy Goals.
- Consider the OWLA recommendation for project funding “set-asides” (OWLA 4/11/18, page 3).
- Suggest an equitable distribution of membership between community representatives and subject area representatives. Funding must support community members to attend meetings.
- Recommend a Technical Assistance Committee that collaborates and helps develop projects with stakeholders.
- The Program must ensure Community Workforce Agreement requirements.
- Define the role of the Watershed Coordinator.
- Consider the characteristics of Local Workforce Job Training. Some characteristics (e.g. Design) might require a college degree.
- Allow flexibility for funding allocated to scientific studies from FCD Program (e.g. Basin Study).



- Recommend funding greater than \$20 million (over five years) from the District Program. Recommend equitable distribution of funds.
- Consider using the Low-Income Water Rate Assistance Act (2015) to define Disadvantaged Communities.
- Consider using the Department of Conservation Watershed Coordinator to define Watershed Coordinator.

4. Public Comments

- Bruce Reznick, Los Angeles Water Keeper
 - Regarding the Municipal Program, funding should go toward Water Quality benefits. Some criteria should exist for the Municipal Program for quality projects.
 - Concerned with the language used Basin Plan study updates.
 - Consider Residential Retrofits from funding from the District pot.
- Lauren Aquillen, Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy
 - Regarding the Municipal Program, explore ways for smaller cities to collaboratively use local return funds to enable construction of Regional projects.
 - Municipal funds should go toward Water Quality benefits and compliance.
 - Recommend funding greater than \$20 million (over five years) from the District Program. Recommend equitable distribution of funds.
 - The Program must ensure Community Workforce Agreement requirements, and job creation.
 - Designate a seat for Social Justice Organizations into the Governance structure.
- Omar Gomez, Nature for All
 - Designate a seat for Social Justice Organizations into the Governance structure.
 - Recommend funding greater than \$20 million (over five years) from the District Program. Recommend equitable distribution of funds.
- Andrew Yip, Nature for All
 - Program must make an effort to include and involve community residents/constituents in meetings, as much as possible.
 - Mentioned the importance of incorporating Nature Based Solutions into Program projects.
- Melanie Winter, The River Project
 - Nature Based Solutions projects are integral in achieving the goals of this Program on all levels.

Lisa Ballin, Center for Collaborative Policy, thanked all in attendance. Attendees were reminded to return after lunch to discuss the elements described in the Regional Program.

ADJOURN SESSION I: 12:00pm-1:00pm

SESSION II (1pm-3pm)

5. Regional Program

Lisa Ballin, Center for Collaborative Policy, called the meeting to order. The second half meeting was to discuss the key elements of the Regional Program.

Russ Bryden, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, began his presentation regarding the Regional Program. The discussion period that followed the presentation was divided into two topics: Governance and Selection Criteria, respectively. The comments received were as follows:



a. Discussion (Governance)

- Concerns with water agency provider vs purveyor used interchangeably. Suggest clarification.
- Suggestion to include South Pasadena in Rio Hondo Watershed.
- Committee members expressed concern with the Watershed Governance map being Los Angeles centric, as well as membership seats.
- Concerns with establishing Stormwater Management Targets for water supply.
- Suggestions to share how existing projects, or projects under construction, have scored given the current criteria.
- Suggest replacing percent land area, with percent urbanized/developed land area for determining governance membership municipal representation for the Steering Committees.
- Suggest limitations where a single agency dominates representation.
- Suggest an equitable distribution of membership between community representatives and subject area (sector) representatives in the Watershed Area Committees and Regional Oversight Committee. Funding must support community members and social justice organizations to attend meetings, and have a voice.
- Provide a Watershed Coordinator for each Watershed Area, with technical expertise and knowledge.
- Provide municipalities with more governance membership representation (e.g. Steering Committees). Municipalities have a greater liability and deserve more representation.
- Suggest a balance of representation in the Steering Committees. Regional focus groups and community groups should have more input in Regional Program.
- Regarding Membership requirements, knowledge and technical expertise should be a minimum requirement (page 29 of the Draft Program Elements).
- Provide more information for the responsibilities of the Technical Committee, and its role with the Watershed Area and Regional Oversight Committee.
- Concerns with the County scoring its own projects.
- Funds should address planning and projects, rather than administration. Concerned with County oversight.

b. Discussion (Selection Criteria)

- Concerns with points assigned to D2 of Selection Criteria, when cities are spending money preparing EWMPs in a collaborative effort. Suggest adding more points to section D2 of the Project Criteria matrix.
- EWMP projects should be grandfathered into the program without going through the criteria process.
- Regarding leveraging and cost-effectiveness, and overlap exists. Consider focusing on these two aspects of criteria and weigh the different outcomes and effects this could have on project selection.
- Suggest additional points awarded to Water Quality Benefits criteria.
- Suggest pollutant removal based criteria for Water Quality Benefit section. This will especially benefit DACs.
- Suggest Measure A metrics for Community Investments Benefits.
- Concerned with how certain BMP projects (e.g. dry weather diversion), and how these will score using current criteria.
- Concerns with requiring Nature Based Solutions in highly developed areas.

Next Steps

Russ, Bryden, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, reminded the committee of the 30-day comment period about how to refine the program. Comments must be received by May 11, 2018. However, the committee was concerned



with the timeline of the next Stakeholder Advisory Committee meeting, which was scheduled on May 9, 2018, and the end of the 30-day comment period. Rescheduling the next Stakeholder Advisory Committee meeting, is under consideration, in order to allow ample time for revisions to the Program Elements.

6. Public Comments

- Grace Kast, Gateway Water
 - Raised a question regarding the context of the Credit Program and when will it be presented to the committee. In response to the question, the Credit Program is still under development. However, there will be a separate comment period for that specific proposal.
- Gloria Medina, Strategic Concepts and Organizing and Policy Education (SCOPE)
 - The inclusion of community members in the project selection process is important. Community members also have a liability in the selection process, and in revenue collection. Communities carry the burden when it comes to pollution and other issues that affect health, and quality of life. Having a community voice will help with issues that affect the community (e.g. displacement, gentrification, etc.).
 - Community members can also offer a different level of expertise that can help in the selection process, and is their participation is important
- Lauren Aquillen, Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy
 - Echoes Gloria's comments.
 - Program must address all three benefits which include, increase water supply, improve water quality, and provide community enhancements.
 - Concerned with funds that are allocated toward O&M. Maintenance for these projects should have adequate resources. Maintenance should be handled by trained and skilled staff.
 - Nature Based and Community Investment benefits are at the forefront amongst community organizers. Funding must prioritize these benefits.
- Melanie Winter, The River Project
 - Echoes Gloria's comment regarding liability.
 - Concerned stakeholder participation and equity. The structure of this program should focus on these issues.
 - There is value and importance in recognizing community member involvement.
 - Consider the SITES Program (Texas) to establish criteria for Community Investments Benefits.
- Larry Forrester, City of Signal Hill
 - Municipalities have a large financial liability. Prioritize Water Quality benefits.
- Eric Wolf, SGVCOG
 - Consider breaking out the Arroyo Seco and combine with the Rio Hondo Watershed (Governance Map, Page 14).
 - Program must support full local control.

7. Adjourn

Katy Young thanked the committee for attending, and encouraged further comments and feedback.

Lisa Ballin adjourned the meeting.