



June 14, 2018

The Honorable Sheila Kuehl, Chair
County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors
821 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Via Email: Sheila@bos.lacounty.gov

Re: Comments on May 25th Safe, Clean Water Draft Program Elements

Dear Supervisor Kuehl:

On behalf of the Los Angeles County Division of the League of California Cities® (Division), and the California Contract Cities Association (CCCA), together representing every city in the Los Angeles County Flood Control District (LAFCD), we write to express our appreciation of the Board of Supervisors' leadership in the development of the proposed Safe, Clean Water Program (Program) and to provide continued comments on the Draft Program Elements and Draft Credit Program released on May 25th.

The Division and CCCA, along with several of our member cities, have participated extensively in the development of the Program over the past two years. Our member cities are keenly aware of the need for a stable stormwater quality funding source to meet federal and State compliance requirements and also support long-term water sustainability in the County. However, given the anticipated political dynamics of the November 2018 ballot- with a likely measure to repeal existing taxes like SB 1- we foresee that voters will be very finicky about approving additional taxes. If they are to approve the Safe, Clean Water Program, the measure must be complete, well-defined, and fair.

In order to assist the Board of Supervisors in finalizing the development the Safe, Clean Water Program, we offer our final comments and suggestions based on the May Draft Program Elements and Draft Credit Program:

- 1. Focus on Water Quality/Compliance-** The primary emphasis should be on water quality, with a secondary emphasis on water supply and a tertiary emphasis on community investment benefits and leveraged funding. We recommend the following allocation: 50% water quality/ 25% water supply/ 15% community investment benefits/ 10% leveraged funding.
- 2. Test Project Scoring Criteria-** The project selection scoring criteria need to be re-examined. The criteria should be tested and shared with stakeholders prior to adopting an implementation ordinance to demonstrate and ensure that projects that maximize water

quality are prioritized in the scoring matrix. The implementation ordinance should allow for scoring criteria to be reviewed and adjusted after one year, if projects with the highest water quality benefits are not being selected.

- 3. Allow Cities to Use Their Own Procurement, Contracting and Reporting Procedure-** The Safe, Clean Water Program should allow cities to use their own procurement and contracting procedures, rather than impose the proposed onerous County contracting requirements. Funding and reporting requirements should be no more onerous than those adopted in Metro’s Measures R and M.
- 4. Increase Municipal Steering Committee Representation-** We continue to stress that the membership of the Watershed Area Steering Committees municipal seats should be increased to at least seven (7).
- 5. Responsibility for Compliance - Joint Projects - Use of Local Return-** As communicated by Public Works staff during a May 17th meeting with numerous city managers, we would like to see language stating that when cities use local return proceeds to fund their portions of joint projects with the County Flood Control District, and the LAFCD is the lead agency in the planning, design, construction, and maintenance of such a joint project, the County should assume responsibility for compliance with the water quality requirements.
- 6. Expand and Clarify Credit Program-** Provide an option for cities with existing voter-approved stormwater fees to “opt-in” to the credit program understanding that program revenues to the city might be offset.
- 7. Ensure Independent and Credible Oversight Committees-** Nominations for Regional Oversight Committee Members and Scoring Committee Members should be submitted by Watershed Area Steering Committees.
- 8. Watershed Coordinator Nominations-** Watershed Coordinators should be nominated by the Watershed Area Steering Committees with whom they will work. Since they will be managed by the LAFCD, Watershed Coordinators should be funded through the District Program rather than the Regional Program.
- 9. Expand and Clarify 10% Administration Program Expenditures-** LACFD administrative program expenditures still need to be clarified. Allocations in this funding category should be defined and based on sound financial calculations and reflect real costs; funds in excess of these calculations should be dedicated back to stormwater projects and programs. A proposed budget would demonstrate transparency to the voters.
- 10. Define “Nature Augmented Solution”-** Since some water quality projects depend partially, but not predominantly, on soils and vegetation, a definition of “nature augmented solutions” should be added to Section 2 of the Draft Program Elements.

11. Regroup Arroyo Seco and Rio Hondo Watersheds- The Arroyo Seco and Rio Hondo Watersheds should be grouped together in a new watershed area.

We thank the Board of Supervisors for leading the effort to develop the Safe, Clean Water Program and hope that these comments and suggestions assist the County and the Flood Control District to develop a successful program that County voters find value in.

Sincerely,



Miguel Canales
Council Member, Artesia
President
Los Angeles County Division, League of
California Cities®



Jorge Morales
Council Member, South Gate
President
California Contract Cities Association

CC: Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors
Katy Young, Office of Supervisor Sheila Kuehl
Mark Pestrella, Director, Los Angeles County Public Works