



# Public Comment Form

Name:\* James Cluxton

Organization\*: OhanaVets, Inc.

Email\*: [REDACTED]

Phone\*: \_\_\_\_\_

Meeting: ROC

Date: 4/7/2026

LA County Public Works may contact me for clarification about my comments

\*Per Brown Act, completing this information is optional. At a minimum, please include an identifier so that you may be called upon to speak.

Phone participants and the public are encouraged to submit public comments (or a request to make a public comment) to [SafeCleanWaterLA@dpw.lacounty.gov](mailto:SafeCleanWaterLA@dpw.lacounty.gov). All public comments will become part of the official record.

Please complete this form and email to [SafeCleanWaterLA@dpw.lacounty.gov](mailto:SafeCleanWaterLA@dpw.lacounty.gov) by at least 5:00pm the day prior to the meeting with the following subject line: "Public Comment: [Watershed Area] [Meeting Date]" (ex. "Public Comment: USGR 4/8/20").

## Comments

Written public comment submitted for the record.

Please see attached document titled:  
"Written Public Comment for the Record – April 8, 2026 ROC Meeting (OhanaVets)"

The attached document contains the complete submission.

James Cluxton, President  
OhanaVets

4/7/2026

Members of the Regional Oversight Committee,

At the last meeting (March 11, 2026), County Counsel formally disputed my prior public comment on the record and indicated that a further response would be prepared. I address those statements here. My prior comment remains part of the official record.

This submission is provided to ensure that the record reflects a complete and accurate factual basis for the Committee's oversight and directly addresses County representations made to this Committee, unresolved governance issues within the program, and deficiencies in the administrative record in a publicly funded process.

The relevant facts are clear and supported by the record.

OhanaVets, a certified Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (DVBE), was given nine days' written notice of non-renewal after more than a year of extensions beyond the original contract term. During that extended period of performance, no defined transition plan was ever established.

To be clear, following notice of non-renewal to OhanaVets and selection of a new Watershed Coordinator, the County did not conduct a transition meeting, did not establish a transition plan, and did not initiate any defined coordination between OhanaVets (outgoing) and the incoming Watershed Coordinator. More than 40 days after execution of the new Watershed Coordinator contract, the County has not issued a single specific request to OhanaVets for documents, contacts, schedules, or transition deliverables.

The County may point to a single generic email, sent after the last ROC meeting, referencing "transition deliverables" and directing coordination with Stantec. That communication does not identify any specific deliverables; no list, no scope, no follow-up, and no defined coordination was established before or after that message. The email is part of the record and speaks for itself.

Accordingly, any assertion presented to this Committee that a transition is "in progress" or underway is not supported by the record. OhanaVets served as the Watershed Coordinator for five years, and the County has not requested a single document, dataset, contact list, or work product for transfer to the incoming Watershed Coordinator, nor has it facilitated any communication or coordination between the outgoing and incoming Watershed Coordinators.

At the same time, the County is withholding payment on an approved final invoice—tied to the return of a pop-up tent and one tablecloth, items of nominal value—while no transition plan, deliverables, or coordination have been defined. The County has not identified any contractual basis for withholding payment, despite a clear written request from OhanaVets' counsel and a stated deadline.

Those materials have been identified and made available for return, yet no practical method for their return has been finalized, and payment continues to be withheld.

This is not about the items. It is about the withholding of an invoice, reviewed and approved by the County for services already performed, without any identified contractual provision authorizing such withholding.

These issues do not stand alone.

In a recent letter, County Counsel characterized OhanaVets' position regarding the County's Brown Act compliance as "hypocritical," stating that the same procedures were used in the prior Watershed Coordinator selection process (December 2020 / January 2021). That claim is factually incorrect and contradicted by the County's own records, including its meeting agendas and minutes.

During that prior selection process (December 2020 / January 2021), conducted virtually, all participants remained in the same meeting throughout presentations, questions, deliberations, and the final vote. No proposers were excluded at any stage. The process was fully observable by all participants throughout.

By contrast, during the July 2025 selection process, all proposers were excluded from an otherwise public meeting during interviews, deliberations, and the vote.

OhanaVets raised this issue with County staff and counsel over a period of months. Rather than addressing the substance of the concern, the County's stated position, repeated across prior communications and most recently reflected in its April 3, 2026 letter, is that OhanaVets is "time-barred" from pursuing the issue further.

That position avoids addressing the underlying facts, and the County's characterization relies on a premise that is demonstrably incorrect.

More broadly, the record reflects unresolved concerns regarding conflict-of-interest review, Brown Act compliance, DVBE participation, and overall program governance. These concerns are documented across meeting statements, correspondence, and Public Records Act responses.

Public Records Act responses have further compounded the issue. Requests for records relating to conflict-of-interest review and governance decisions have resulted in statements that no records exist, or that materials are not subject to disclosure ("not in the public interest"), while at the same time confirming that issues were identified or reviewed. This results in a public record that is incomplete and internally inconsistent.

The result is a record that confirms that decisions were made but does not allow the public to evaluate how or why those decisions were reached.

Taken together, this reflects a pattern of inconsistency between public statements and actual conduct, breakdowns in basic contract administration, and a failure by the County to engage directly or resolve issues when they are raised.

In a publicly funded program of this scale, decisions must be supported by a clear, consistent, and verifiable administrative record. That record has not been fully produced or made publicly available in a complete and consistent manner, despite multiple formal requests.

This is not a matter of interpretation. It is a matter of public accountability, established by and reflected in the County's own record.

I ask that the record reflect these facts and that the Committee direct the County to substantively address these matters in the administrative record, with supporting documentation available for public review.

Thank you.

James Cluxton  
President, OhanaVets