



Public Comment Form

Name:* James Cluxton Organization*: OhanaVets

Email*: _____ Phone*: _____

Meeting: LSGR WASC Date: 5/12/2026

- 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. All public comments will become part of the official record.

Please complete this form and email to 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

I am submitting this comment on behalf of OhanaVets, Inc., a Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (DVBE) and the former Lower San Gabriel River (LSGR) Watershed Coordinator under the Los Angeles County Safe Clean Water Program (SCWP).

OhanaVets served the program for five years, supporting WASC meetings, stakeholder engagement, working groups, and community outreach, including independently developing and deploying an interactive educational trailer to support SCWP public education without seeking additional County support or reimbursement.

This submission provides a focused update regarding the LSGR Watershed Coordinator selection process, related Public Records Act (CPRA) responses, and associated governance, transparency, and transition concerns, and seeks clarification for the record.

After exhausting administrative channels over approximately eight months, OhanaVets submitted correspondence to County Counsel outlining concerns regarding the LSGR Watershed Coordinator selection process. In its April 3, 2026 response, the County characterized OhanaVets' concerns as "fanciful, hypocritical, and unpersuasive," while asserting that the "same procedures" were used in both the 2020–2021 selection process and the July 8, 2025 proceeding.

That assertion is materially inconsistent with the documented record.

(Comment continues on following two pages)

(Continued from Public Comment Card submitted by James Cluxton)

In the 2020–2021 selection process, proposers remained present throughout the public meeting and were able to observe all presentations, public comment, deliberations, and the final vote. In contrast, during the July 8, 2025 proceeding, proposers were directed to leave the meeting for extended periods, preventing observation of presentations, public comment, deliberations, and the vote.

This difference is material and forms the basis of the concerns raised regarding process transparency, consistency, and the conduct of the selection process.

Public Works' CPRA responses further reinforce these concerns. In response to a request seeking the factual basis for the County's April 3, 2026 characterization of OhanaVets' concerns as "fanciful, hypocritical, and unpersuasive," Public Works confirmed that, after a "thorough and diligent search," no records were identified reflecting any factual basis for that characterization.

Public Works has also now responded to a separate request seeking the factual basis for the County's assertion that the "same procedures" were used in both the 2020–2021 selection process and the July 8, 2025 proceeding. In response, Public Works produced general meeting materials, agendas, minutes, interview materials, and Watershed Coordinator process documents, but did not identify any actual comparison, evaluation, determination, or documented analysis supporting the County's assertion that the procedures were "the same," particularly with respect to proposer participation in, and observation of, the public meeting.

In fact, the records produced appear to reinforce the existence of procedural differences rather than explain or reconcile them.

Additional requests involving process transparency, conflicts-of-interest concerns, and governance-related issues have similarly resulted in broad assertions of privilege, "no records" determinations, and responses stating that responsive records do exist, but are being withheld because "the public interest served by not disclosing the record clearly outweigh[s] the public interest served by disclosure of the record," despite these matters involving a publicly funded program and public selection process.

These responses raise questions directly relevant to this Committee's role in ensuring transparency and consistency in the selection process. This Committee represents the public, and the public has a right to understand how these issues have been handled within a publicly funded program.

Separately, despite public representations implying that transition and continuity activities were proceeding normally, the documented record reflects no meaningful transition coordination involving OhanaVets following the selection process. To date, OhanaVets has

had no direct correspondence with the incoming Watershed Coordinator regarding transition or continuity matters, and no operational handoff discussions, continuity planning, lessons learned, stakeholder introductions, or transfer of institutional knowledge associated with the LSGR Watershed Coordinator role have occurred.

These are documented administrative facts reflected in the County's own records and responses—not speculation, emotion, or contractor disappointment.

Request:

Accordingly, we respectfully request that this Committee seek a clear explanation from Public Works regarding:

- The factual and procedural basis for the County's assertion that the "same procedures" were used in both the 2020–2021 and July 8, 2025 selection processes;

- The differences in proposer participation, observation, and access during the July 8, 2025 proceeding relative to prior selection cycles;

- The handling of Public Records Act requests related to process transparency, governance, and conflicts-of-interest concerns;

- The absence of any meaningful transition coordination despite a multi-year program administration change; and

- The handling of contract closeout and payment withholding issues.

Because the July 8 recommendation ultimately originated from this Committee, we believe the Committee deserves a clear understanding of how these issues are being advanced and publicly represented by County staff and counsel.

A publicly funded program cannot simply dismiss documented concerns raised by a Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise operating in good faith under County direction and expect those concerns to disappear without transparency, accountability, and public scrutiny.

OhanaVets has comprehensively documented these issues and preserved the associated administrative record, correspondence, and supporting materials, and is prepared to provide them to the Committee upon request.