



CITY OF  
*Palos Verdes Estates*

---

May 11, 2018

Mr. Mark Pestrella, Director of Public Works  
Angela George-Moody, Deputy Director – Water Resources  
County of Los Angeles  
900 S. Fremont Avenue  
Alhambra, CA 91803

Via email: [mpestrella@dpw.lacounty.gov](mailto:mpestrella@dpw.lacounty.gov); [agmoody@dpw.lacounty.gov](mailto:agmoody@dpw.lacounty.gov)

Dear Mr. Pestrella and Ms. George-Moody:

The City of Palos Verdes Estates City Council will not consider taking a position on the Safe, Clean Water parcel tax until it is in final form for presentation to the County Board of Supervisors. However, City staff appreciates the opportunity to offer our comments on the draft program elements for your consideration as you make final changes. We truly appreciate the significant effort and commitment of time and resources by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works and the Flood Control District (LACDPW/FCD) staff to develop the Safe, Clean Water Draft Program Elements (Program). It is clear that much thought and stakeholder outreach has gone into the Program's development.

Municipalities in the Los Angeles region are facing enormous Clean Water Act stormwater compliance costs, including both capital outlay and maintenance costs, with no secure funding to meet their regulatory compliance obligations. Municipalities are individually obligated to meet Clean Water Act regulatory compliance objectives in terms of effluent limitations and waste load allocations set by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board through the Municipal Stormwater Permit and approved Enhanced/Watershed Management Programs (E/WMPs). To meet regulatory compliance objectives, costs are high and many projects are still unfunded and funding for other critical programs will need to be diverted. It is critical that the primary Program objectives of capturing stormwater and reducing stormwater and urban runoff pollution are realized so that municipalities can obtain regulatory certainty. With that said, certain elements of the Program need to be further clarified and refined to assure that program funding and project selection will support attainment of Clean Water Act compliance objectives for each municipality and E/WMP group.

Comments and suggestions for modifications to the Program are provided for your consideration below.

**MUNICIPAL PROGRAM EXPENDITURES**

1. Imposition of Los Angeles County contracting requirements on every municipality that receives the 40% local return municipal funds would create an unreasonable and untenable burden on small municipalities. Additionally, some of the requirements appear unrelated to water and public works issues. At a minimum, cities would need to be provided with more

information relating to these requirements to understand how the provisions would apply. These provisions could conflict with requirements that cities have in other contracts.

It is strongly recommended that this requirement be eliminated from the Agreements for Transfer of SCW Program Funds as there is concern that this matter could create issues for obtaining full support of the measure.

2. Municipal Program Funds expenditure requirements should be flexible to meet agencies' needs rather than mandating that 70% be spent on new water quality activities and that only 30% may be spent on baseline water quality activities—a 50% distribution between baseline and new activities may be more appropriate considering how much effort MS4 Permittees have undertaken since adoption of the 2012 LA MS4 Permit. Also, please clarify that operation and maintenance costs for “new” projects are also considered to be ongoing “new” costs. Municipalities' needs will change over time as new projects are completed, operation and maintenance funds will then be needed until the end of the useful life of a project at which point capital funds will again be required.
3. The “effective start date of the SCW Program”, i.e., the date prior to which municipal program SCW Program eligible activities are considered “baseline” as opposed to “new” program expenditures, should be the date the Regional Board approved the E/WMP rather than the date of approval of the parcel tax by the voters. This will ensure that municipalities that have moved promptly to implement water quality programs, projects and enhanced minimum control measures as described in the E/WMPs are not penalized for carrying out E/WMP commitments promptly.

## **GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE**

1. Rather than guaranteeing a seat/vote to the largest municipalities with at least 16% taxable land area in the Watershed area, each E/WMP group within the Watershed Area boundaries should have a municipal representative on the Watershed Area Steering Committee. No municipality should have more than one seat/vote on each Watershed Area Steering Committee. This amended seat/vote requirement should be sufficient to make sure interests are adequately represented.
2. It is not clear why a large, open space stakeholder is needed on the Regional Oversight Committee and on every Watershed Area Steering Committee since the primary purpose of the program according to AB 1180 is “to pay the costs and expenses of carrying out projects and programs to increase stormwater capture and reduce stormwater and urban runoff pollution in the district...”<sup>1</sup> Consider eliminating the Open Space Stakeholder position or leaving the stakeholder position undesignated to allow for flexibility by the Watershed Area Steering and Regional Oversight Committees in filling that seat as they determine is most appropriate to the needs and characteristics of the Watershed Area.
3. It is important that Watershed Area Steering Committees be seated with members that are clearly qualified to make important decisions on the selection of projects to receive funding. If qualified and interested Community Stakeholders are not available to fill all four seats on each Watershed Area Steering Committee, then it should be up to the discretion of the Watershed Area Steering Committee to reduce the number of Community Stakeholder seats.

---

<sup>1</sup> AB 1180 (Holden 2017) Section 2. 8a.

Watershed Area Steering Committees should not be required to seat more than one (or at most two) Community Stakeholders who don't meet the General Minimum Qualifications for all Members (page 29).

### PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS

1. Assuming the voters approve the Safe, Clean Water tax in November 2018, we understand that funds would not become available for transfer to project proponents until Winter of 2020. Yet, municipalities need to proceed with capital projects that may be currently in the planning, design or even construction phases in order to meet milestones and deadlines in approved E/WMPs. The E/WMP approval date should be the effective start date for cost recovery under the Program for selected regional projects or eligible municipal capital projects, including planning, design and construction costs. This will ensure that municipalities and E/WMP groups that have taken significant steps to implement E/WMP commitments in terms of regional and distributed projects are not penalized.
2. Not all regional stormwater capture projects will have a clear nexus with water supply benefits, particularly those in coastal watershed areas that are located west of the of the West Coast Groundwater Basin Barrier Project or in areas where there is no underlying groundwater basin. Yet such regional projects may be critical to achieve the Clean Water Act compliance objectives identified by an E/WMP group. Such projects should not be penalized in the Regional Project Scoring Criteria.
3. Transparency and accountability are important in expending public funds, however these must be balanced with efficiency and flexibility to ensure the timely selection, development and implementation of projects without unnecessary administrative burden. The Six Step Regional Project selection and funding process is quite complex and could be further streamlined while still maintaining transparency and accountability. An annual frequency/cycle for all six steps in each and every Watershed Area may result in excessive administrative effort and delays in schedule/approvals of projects due to bottlenecks in the process. Since the call for projects will be biennial, and the Stormwater Investment Plans will be 5-year plans, could the six-step process be reduced to a biennial process with staggered calls for projects for different Watershed Area Steering Committees to reduce the administrative burden and propensity for bottlenecks in the process?

The City of Palos Verdes Estates appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the draft elements of the Program and offers these comments to help achieve the most cost-effective and equitable program possible.

Sincerely,



Ken Rukavina  
Public Works Director and City Engineer

Copy: Russ Bryden, Principal Engineer, [rbryden@dpw.lacounty.gov](mailto:rbryden@dpw.lacounty.gov)