

Safe, Clean Water Program

Regional Oversight Committee



Meeting Minutes:

Wednesday, May 20, 2020
12:30pm - 2:30pm
WebEx Meeting

Attendees

Committee Members Present:

Maria Mehranian (Cordoba Corp.)
Diana Tang (City of Long Beach)
Kristine Guerrero (League of Cities)
Belinda Faustinos (Nature for All)
Shelley Luce (Heal the Bay) – Co-chair
Lauren Ahkiam (LAANE) – Vice-chair

Elva Yanez (Prevention Institute)
Charles Trevino (Upper San Gabriel Valley
Municipal Water District)
Carl Blum* (LA County Flood Control District)
Irma Munoz* (LA Regional Water Quality Control
Board)

Committee Members Absent:

Barbara Romero (City of Los Angeles) – Co-chair
*Non-voting members

See attached sign-in sheet for full list of attendees

1. Welcome and Introductions

Member attendance was confirmed by Matthew Frary (District) before beginning the meeting. The District conducted an overview of WebEx functionality and meeting protocols for both the committee members and the public, reiterated the distributed materials and their availability on the webpage, and discussed the video conferencing guidelines.

Ms. Shelley Luce chaired the meeting and provided an overview of the agenda and welcomed the committee members and the public. The District conducted a rollcall of the committee members and a quorum was confirmed.

2. Approval of March 3, 2020 meeting minutes

The District displayed a copy of the meeting minutes from the previous meeting and the Chair invited discussion and comments. Ms. Elva Yanez requested 3 minor revisions, two of which were wording clarifications to capture past tense and preferred terminology. The third request was related to the interpretation of the District's update regarding the guidelines for determining the 110% DAC ratio. Mr. Frary clarified the statement's intent to document District's approach to date and the committee concurred it was accurate as is.

Ms. Belinda Faustinos moved to approve the meeting minutes with amendments as discussed and Ms. Maria Mehranian seconded the motion. The amended minutes were approved unanimously.

3. Public Comment Period

The Chair reiterated the 4 methods available for public comment and the order they would typically be addressed (comments cards submitted in advance, WebEx raised hands, callers, and requests in chat box), and then asked the District to facilitate. Mr. Frary acknowledged that there were 3 comment cards submitted (attached to these minutes) and called on each to unmute and share their comment.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Regional Oversight Committee



Mr. Richard Watson shared additional details of the Skylinks Project (from the LSGR Watershed Area) for committee consideration.

Mr. Shahriar Eftekharzadeh stated that the projects recommended for approval were not sufficiently evaluated technically and not optimal. He requested that the ROC remind the WASCs to further evaluate the projects.

Ms. Annelisa Moe, representing the Our Water LA (OWLA) Coalition, reviewed the status of each Stormwater Investment Plan (SIP) and summarized OWLA's position of support for the NSMB and SGR SIPs and a neutral position for the SCR SIP.

In response to solicitation of additional comment, Ms. Kim Orbe, Nature For All, stated the importance of greater community support and community engagement during the application process. She stated that projects accepting points from the Scoring Committee for Community Investment Benefit should be supported with letters by the community and that DAC benefits should be more strongly justified. She also acknowledged that there is improvement to the information on the webpage but recommends including meeting materials further in advance of the meetings and that they be shared in other languages.

4. Committee Member and District Updates

The committee members did not have any updates to report.

Mr. Frary provided the District updates on WASC efforts towards SIP development, status of SIP transmittals, and anticipated timeline for approval. Updates on the Transfer Agreement templates included discussion of the public review period, comments incorporated, and targeted approval by the Board of Supervisors in early June 2020. An update of the overall evaluation of program cited ongoing development of tools and efforts and how to work with academia, how reporting will bring a wealth of data, and the upcoming development of the dashboard to visualize the benefits. Mr. Frary also announced that the Watershed Coordinators Request for Statement of Qualifications (RFSQ) should be released after the Memorial Day holiday. The solicitation will last 8 weeks with two meetings to inform the applicants of the process and requirements and address questions. Next, the Call for Projects for the second round of consideration has been open since December 2019 and was slated to end on July 31, 2020. The District has extended the Call for Project until October 15, 2020. Additionally, an update of the tax collection and relief programs was given, citing that the deadline for most programs was May 1, 2020 and that all applications received are being processed. Revenue collected to date for this fiscal year is approximately 90% of the expected \$285 million. An overview of the WHAM committee was provided with a reminder about the type of SCW Program details expected to be incorporated in the WHAM effort.

Ms. Mehranian asked a clarifying question regarding the Call for Projects extension. Matt answered that the Year 2 Call for Projects has been open and will remain open. Ms. Faustinos asked if applicants that are not selected would have to reapply to the Regional Program. Mr. Frary responded that the applicants who would like to be reconsidered without changing the scope or cost will remain in the project module for FY21-22, but applicants that change their project scope, cost, or details would need to reapply.

5. Ex Parte Communication Disclosures

Ms. Luce reported meetings with OWLA core team on March 17, April 21, and May 9, OWLA team members and District staff on April 7, and a presentation she provided on the SIP recommendations to the water leaders' group on May 7.

Safe, Clean Water Program

Regional Oversight Committee



Ms. Faustinos provided a written submittal of Ex Parte communications (attached), including many of the same OWLA meetings as Ms. Luce and a project meeting with city of Monrovia and Craftwater regarding a project in the Rio Hondo WA. See attached.

Ms. Mehranian reported participation in a presentation on Mac Arthur Park with Supervisor Hilda Solis' staff.

6. Public Comment Period

The Chair acknowledged the unique role of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and the committee's desire and request to hear their feedback on proposed SIPs. Ms. Jenny Newman indicated that the SIP transmittal packages and summaries were very useful, shared some general comments, and provided feedback on the SIPs for NSMB, SCR, and LSGR. She noted that the 3 SIPs under consideration did not include projects that were already funded.

For the LSGR SIP, all seven projects are included in the Enhanced Watershed Management Plan (EWMP) and RWQCB staff have no objections to their inclusion in the SIP. For NSMB, the plan did not include any infrastructure projects, and the one County project that was considered and then withdrawn was encouraged to reapply for funding since it was included in the EWMP. The inclusion of a part-time Watershed Coordinator should help identify good projects for future consideration. For SCR, both projects included for funding are included in the relevant EWMP as Tier A BMP projects, and they support this SIP as well.

Additional public comment was solicited and received. Mr. Eftekhazadeh stated that the SIPs are recommended 5-year investments and expressed the desire for committees to recommit lower amounts of funding to subsequent years of allocation.

Ms. Yanez commented that the Project Module used to collect project information utilized a yes or no question regarding benefit to DACs and requested consideration be made to get more detailed justifications up front to assist in the evaluation of specific proposals at each stage in the process.

Ms. Diana Tang, in response to Mr. Eftekhazadeh, commented that funding needs are significant, a solution is finally here, and that projects and recommendations appear to have been thoroughly considered. She was grateful for the funding to develop the back log of projects that have been in development for years. She thanked the committees for the development of the SIPs.

Ms. Mehranian shared her interest for future NSMB SIPs to include projects, wanted to know if the project that withdrew would be brought back, and asked Ms. Newman to comment. Ms. Newman said the funds would roll over to the next year, and that RWQCB staff would be available to work the the proponent as needed for future consideration. Ms. Faustinos and Ms. Luce agreed that there should be a collaborative effort to revisit this project as needed.

Ms. Munoz stated that there will not be equity if communities are not continually informed of opportunities and reiterated support to require applicants to do community engagement as appropriate.

7. Discussion of Available Stormwater Investment Plan (SIP) Recommendations

Mr. Frary displayed the map of submitted projects being considered for funding by the WASCs. He reviewed contextual considerations from the Operating Guidelines and acknowledged the additional considerations given the current situation, ranging from caution due to potential future funding impacts to the need to invest in the economy to the upcoming on-boarding of Watershed Coordinators. He reminded the ROC that each application was scored and considered as it was submitted, including the requested supplemental information to clarify each applicants request over the 5-year cycle. Mr. Frary reiterated the primary role of the ROC to provide recommendations to the Board, including any comments, especially for those where feedback was provided to WASCs and a subsequent SIP brought



before the ROC. He gave examples of comments to clarify that the intent is for any feedback to WASCs to focus on overall SIP programming and composition rather than modifying a specific project (which would require removal from SIP, re-scoping, and resubmission for a future round).

Ms. Luce explained that each SIP would be considered and discussed to see if recommendations could be made on each SIP. Ms. Faustinos suggested the vote on the SIPs occur after a complete discussion versus each individual SIP. Ms. Luce confirmed that voting would occur after full discussion.

Ms. Faustinos reiterated her interest to see community input/engagement for the recommended projects. Mr. Trevino stressed that, due to the coronavirus situation and varying project stages, the community should be more flexible regarding the weight given to community participation to date and continue to focus on additional engagement going forward.

- **North Santa Monica Bay (NSMB) SIP**

Mr. David Pedersen, the Chair of the North Santa Monica Bay WASC, spoke on behalf of the WASC. He explained why the SIP does not include any infrastructure projects this first year and stated that the area has great needs but the relatively small population results in a relatively small annual revenue (less than what would be required for many projects) that may need to be accrued and leveraged. He indicated that a number of potential projects were not even submitted due to their anticipated inability to meet the Threshold score. Additionally, the one project submitted by the County was withdrawn. The County, to their credit, was sensitive to the optics of this program, as the county project was a large project that would require the entire watershed area's funds for multiple years. The NSMB WASC expects to see the project come back in future years with a lower funding request and is recommending funding of the half-time Watershed Coordinator position while strategizing how to perhaps use local funding to secure a full-time watershed coordinator position. He pointed out that the recommended SIP was approved unanimously by the WASC.

Ms. Mehranian asked if other sources of funding were optimized to improve score for the projects that did not pass the threshold score. Mr. Pedersen confirmed that projects for this area would need to rely on additional funding sources, such as Prop 1, and are striving to do so.

Ms. Faustinos asked about the scale of the projects considered for the SIP. Mr. Pedersen spoke about the one project submitted to the WASC; he stated that projects in that area had difficulty meeting the threshold score due to challenges in the water supply category. This area does not overlie a traditional groundwater basin, so the basic stormwater capture and infiltration strategy does not produce useable water for the region. The committee would like the ROC and Scoring Committee to keep this in mind going forward.

Ms. Munoz asked if the NSMB WASC made attempts for community engagement participation. Mr. Pedersen replied that there was good participation during the WASC meetings, but agreed that the committee would need to continue to encourage the public to attend and participate more during all stages of the process in the future.

- **Santa Clara River (SCR) SIP**

Mr. Jason Gibbs, the Vice Chair of the Santa Clara River WASC, spoke on behalf of the WASC. The SIP allocates 82% for the first year of funding, including two infrastructure projects and the Watershed Coordinator.



Ms. Luce asked about the percent allocation per year. Mr. Gibbs replied that the percentage of funds allocated in year 1 through year 5 is 82%, 74%, 69%, 38% and 29%, respectively. He reminded the ROC that the left-over amount of funds would be available for the next year and the percent allocated is out of the sum of the annual estimate for that year's revenue and all rolled over funds from prior years. Mr. Frary confirmed Mr. Gibbs' interpretation of the SIP data.

Ms. Ahkiam asked why the allocation for Newhall Park Infiltration funding request on the SIP did not match the original application asking for \$3M for funding. Mr. Frary replied that the initial Projects Module forms were not being interpreted and populated uniformly. As such, the District solicited supplemental information outside of the module from all project proponents to clarify funding requested across years and phases. This information was made available for review with the initial applications and other materials. The Projects Module has already been updated and therefore this information will be included in the initial applications going forward.

Ms. Faustinos would like to see the total project cost, total requested SCW funds, and the confidence level or status of claimed leveraged funds. Ms. Luce would like to add in the columns on future SIP transmittals. Mr. Frary noted where to find this information in the existing materials and indicated the District would also look into highlighting it in the summaries/transmittals going forward.

Ms. Ahkiam asked about Santa Clarita's approach to Local Worker Target Hire (LWTH) and the County's Project Labor Agreement (PLA) would be now that the larger amount of funding is requested, which is now much larger but doesn't meet the \$20M threshold. Ms. Merenda responded that there would be multiple sources of funding for the project, and the \$18M requested would be used for the water quality portion. Ms. Merenda stated that the City would adhere to all provisions required by the Transfer Agreement, including LTWH and PLA.

Ms. Munoz would like the recommendations and lessons learned heard by this committee to be forwarded on to applicants and committees for future years. Ms. Luce agreed that incorporation of the comments would be helpful.

Ms. Luce would like the committee to talk about the community engagement of the projects on the SIP. Ms. Merenda responded that Santa Clarita has a community services department to discuss projects as an ongoing conversation with the communities in the city, and they have engagement and robust outreach planned as soon as the project moves forward. Ms. Munoz asked for details about their robust outreach approach. Ms. Merenda responded that the group has charettes, focus groups, and multiple opportunities during different times of the days and at public spaces.

Ms. Mehranian stated observations of the ROC to date include the need for watershed coordinators and more public outreach for projects. She restated that the ROC should send high-level observations to the Board. Ms. Luce recommends a letter or report with all of the recommendations. Mr. Frary reminded the committee that the current topic focused on comments regarding the SIPs and that program-wide comments can still be submitted via other means.

- **Lower San Gabriel River (LSGR) SIP**

The committee determined to extend the meeting for another 20 to 30 minutes. Ms. Ahkiam and Mr. Trevino had to leave for other obligations.

Ms. Lisa Rapp, the Chair of the Lower San Gabriel River WASC, spoke on behalf of the WASC. She stated that there are tremendous needs in the area, and the committee wanted to spread



the benefits throughout the watershed area. Three projects were not included on the SIP that had been considered (two were withdrawn and one did not pass the Threshold Score). Of the projects included on the SIP, three are construction projects, one a design only project, and three are O&M projects. The committee had robust community engagement during the selection meetings, and the projects individually had robust engagement. The SIP being presented was voted on unanimously by the WASC.

Ms. Faustinos thanked Ms. Rapp for her inclusive and well-run committee meetings. She would like to understand how much of the funding was requested by the SCW Program in comparison to total project cost and inquired about the costs associated with Hermosillo Par.. Mr. Hunter, project proponent for Hermosillo Park Project, responded that their application for State funds was not funded and that the city would not be providing leveraging funds; as such, the funds for the project would rely on the Infrastructure Program.

Ms. Tang thanked Ms. Rapp for the LSGR WASC's hard work and looked forward to working with the project proponents included on the SIP.

Ms. Guerrero appreciated the submissions from project applicants and acknowledged the evolving processes re: public engagement, which should be strengthened by Watershed Coordinators (WCs). Ms. Guerrero also asked how community stakeholder members on the WASCs were or will be involved in the community engagement processes. Mr. Frary clarified that all WASC members are encouraged to be engaged with their region and promote such engagement, but that the community stakeholder members are not specifically tasked with particular community engagement functions. Ms. Luce agreed that having WCs will increase public engagement, approving large amounts of funding without WCs is far from ideal, and improved reporting of public engagement in future rounds is imperative. Mr. Frary reiterated that reporting requirements will indeed include and capture the community engagement. Some projects did not have all the SCW Program goals (including more extensive public engagement) in mind when developing the project because they pre-dated the creation of the program, but that future submissions are likely to continue to align better and better with more SCW Program goals as crafting of projects occurs under the new and shifting paradigm.

Ms. Faustinos put forward a motion to defer voting on the SIPs until the next meeting in order to first review the revised Transfer Agreement templates (available in June) and their language related to quantifiable targets for water quality, water supply, and community investments. She restated that she would also like to see the total cost and SCW funds requested; and would like to see the total amount of leveraging funds that have been accounted for. She recommended a 3-hour meeting for the next ROC meeting. Ms. Luce agreed that additional time may be warranted and committed to discuss with the District. The motion was not seconded.

Ms. Guerrero made a substitute motion. She stated that the SIPs have gone through substantial consideration at the WASC level and motioned to move the items forward by voting on the SIPs. Ms. Mehranian seconded the motion to not hold the items for further consideration at future meetings and Ms. Tang supported as well. Ms. Munoz also recommended voting take place and affirmed that she agrees that standardized reporting will be necessary for proponents to understand what is required going forward.

Ms. Faustinos would like consolidated comments on the SIPs before voting. Ms. Mehranian proposed that comments could be summarized in meeting minutes and circulated by District staff for review.



The chair indicated that the motion would be revisited at the proper time in the agenda, following public comment.

8. Public Comment Period

Mr. Frary read a public comment about whether a part-time watershed coordinator was allowed. Mr. Frary clarified that the NSMB WC position would be part-time due to the budgetary restrictions in that watershed area and that counsel confirmed that a part-time position was allowable in the unique case of NSMB WASC.

9. Voting Items

Ms. Luce stated that it was now time to entertain a vote on the SIPs or establish feedback and send it back to the WASC(s). She stated that the discussion suggested that there may be some preference to approve the SIP with general feedback.

Ms. Tang made a motion to approve the LSGR SIP and send it to the Board. Ms. Mehranian requested clarification on which motion was moving forward, as there were three motions up for consideration and the motion for approval of the three SIPs made earlier by Ms. Guerrero's motion had been seconded. Ms. Tang withdrew her motion to support the one that had been seconded and the chair invited any additional comments before the committee voted on the motion.

Ms. Faustinos commented that she was voting no because the Transfer Agreement details on reporting are not available, and she would like to know what is required before voting. Ms. Luce commented that she would vote no on the motion because she would like consolidated comments that are all agreed upon in advance. Mr. Frary clarified that comments on the program as a whole could be separated from the comments on the 3 SIPs. Ms. Munoz supported the motion.

The motion was restated for clarity: to approve and advance all 3 SIPs to the Board and to ensure meeting minutes captured high level comments that would be shared with the Board. *SEE ATTACHED

There was a roll call vote on the motion and the motion was approved (4 votes yes; 2 votes no; 3 voting members absent).

Ms. Faustinos would like to split the workload of the future meetings between the next two ROC meetings by considering 3 SIPs on each of the next two meetings rather than six SIPs on the June 18th meeting. Ms. Luce indicated the importance that the next two meetings result in final action on the remaining six SIPs and asked Mr. Frary about the logistics of the future meetings. Mr. Frary confirmed they could discuss all these issue further in preparation for the next agendas.

10. Items for Next Agenda

Ms. Luce stated that the agenda items for the next meeting would include additional SIP approvals and perhaps a review of the Transfer Agreements. Following discussion, it was agreed that, since the Transfer Agreements will have already been before the Board, a short update would be prudent to allow the committee to focus on the SIPs.

Ms. Munoz would like to help craft some guidance for the committees about public engagement and would like to include a ten minute discussion of community engagement for the next meeting.

11. Meeting Adjourned

Shelley Luce thanked the committee members and public for their time and participation and adjourned the meeting.



Summary of comments to share with Board when recommending approval of these 3 SIPs

- Prospective proponents and WASCs should make every effort to incorporate maximum community engagement at all project stages. It is understood that the transfer agreements require a baseline level going forward (and routine reporting on the efforts), but the ROC also desires to see as much community engagement and input as possible during the development of concepts and throughout implementation. Additional detail on community input and engagement to date (and detailed plans for future engagement) should be called for and emphasized up front in the SCWP Regional Program application process Projects Module.
- The Projects Module used to collect project information should solicit more detailed justifications for claimed benefits to DACs to assist in the evaluation of specific proposals at each stage in the process.
- SIP transmittals should include total project cost (not just total requested SCW funds) and the confidence level or status of claimed leveraged funds.
- Once authorized by the Board, every effort should be made to expedite the placement of Watershed Coordinators.
- The District should continue to develop tools and templates to standardize general reporting and tracking of benefits.

Attendees

Regional Oversight Committee Meeting – May 20th, 2020

Mark Seits	Alberto Grajeda	Gregor Patsch - Torrent Resources
Shelley Luce	Richard Watson	DSEEGMILLER
Alfredo M	Conor Mossavi - LADWP	JJC
V. Bapna	Lauren Ahkiam	Ariel Flores - LASAN
CJ Caluag - LACFCD	Iwen Tseng	Maria Mehranian
Christine McLeod	Michael Omary	justin
Elva Yanez	john hunter	Adam Galia
Sheila Brice	Irma Munoz	David Pedersen
K. Vivanti	Christine McLeod	Tori Klug (Stantec)
Brenda Ponton, Woodard & Curran	Charles Trevino	Lisa Rapp
Conor Mossavi - LADW	G. Greene	Lauren Ahkiam
Hans Tremmel	Alvin Cruz	Tom Love
Ruby Wang	Kevin Chang	Melissa You
Bruce Hamamoto	Aydin Pasebani	Shahram Kharaghani
Oliver Galang	D. Deets	Allen Ma
Samantha Matthews (SGVCOG)	Kim Orbe	Jenny Newman
Paul Alva	Thalia Campos	Johanna
Darren Hernandez	Jon Dearing	Katie Mika
Drew Ready	Christine McLeod	Conor Mossavi - LADW
Alex Paxton	Jason Glbbs	Joshua Nelson
Julie Millett, Richard Watson & Assc.	Liz Crosson	Traci Minamide
Melissa Turcotte	Rafferty Wooldridge	Sheila Brice
holts	Kathleen McGowan	Annelisa Moe
Kevin Kim - LACFCD	Renee purdy	Kevin sharpton
Matt Frary - LACFCD	Lynda	Shahriar Eftekhazadeh
Richard Watson	Carl L Blum	Diana Tang
Michelle Kim (JLHA)	Kristine Guerrero	William O'Braitis
bspruit	Mark Lombos	Gregor Patsch - Torrent Resources
Belinda V Faustinos	Jill Sourial	Bryce Lee
	Michael Gagan	Brett Perry
	Heather Merenda	



Public Comment Form

Name*: Richard Watson Organization*: Richard Watson & Associates
Email*: rwatson@rwaplanning.com Phone*: 949-394-8495
Meeting: Regional Oversight Committee Date: 20 May 2020

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 a consultant to the Los Cerritos Channel Watershed, and I have been involved with the development of this project since I included it in the Los Cerritos Channel Watershed Management program. It is a critical project for the watershed for two key reasons. It has a 1,600 acre tributary area that contains commercial and industrial facilities that could contribute copper, lead, and zinc, and the watershed has EPA-established TMDLs for these metals. In addition, capturing dry-weather flows from this watershed will help the Watershed meet its 2025 target to be in compliance with bacteria standards during dry weather.

The lead agency for the project will be the City of Long Beach, and the project has been designed in coordination with the owner and operator of the Skylinks Golf Course where it will be located on a currently residual portion of the golf course property.

The Watershed Group voluntarily deferred another project that was also proposed for funding through the Safe Clean Water Program in order to increase the probability of this project being funded because of its importance to the watershed.

I will be likely be unable to cover the entire meeting, but will try to make myself available to answer any questions the the Committee might have. If I lose computer connection, I will call into the meeting.



Public Comment Form

Name:* Shahriar Eftekhazadeh Organization*: SEITec
Email*: Shahriar.Eftekhazadeh@SEITecinc.com Phone*: 310 879 9376
Meeting: Supervisory Committee Date: 5/20/2020

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

The recommended project concept in a feasibility study must incorporate BMPs (Best Management Practices) that maximize the project benefits at minimum cost.

According to Chapter 18, Section 7, item g of the County Flood Control District Municipal Code "Each Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC) shall review and evaluate the proposed Project scores, proposed Project concepts and proposed studies, and shall prepare and submit a SIP...."

Merriam-Webster dictionary defines "evaluate" to mean "to determine or fix the value of". So, in preparing and submitting a SIP, WASC members are directly tasked to determine the value i.e. the cost-effectiveness of a proposed Project concept, particularly in meeting the SCW Program goals.

Unfortunately, WASC members do not seem to be engaging in the true evaluation of the proposed Project concepts. There appears to be no scrutiny of the technical merits of the Project, no evaluation of the Project cost-effectiveness, and no questioning of whether more cost-effective alternatives have been considered or missed.

This is true even when the WASC members are informed of a far better Project Alternative in satisfying the SCW Program criteria, including nature-based solutions, innovation, community benefits, cost-effectiveness, and budget, which the applicant appears to have overlooked.



Public Comment Form

Name:* Shahriar Eftekhazadeh Organization*: SEITec

Email*: Shahriar.Eftekhazadeh@SEITecinc.com Phone*: 310 879 9376

Meeting: Supervisory Committee Date: 5/20/2020

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

The total funding allocated per year in any recommended SIP must not exceed the anticipated annual regional program funds for the watershed.

This is because any dollar allocated more in any year will leave one dollar less from future projects.

Therefore, unless there is a compelling reason that current year projects are preferred and take priority over future years projects, total allocation in the 5-year SIP must be limited to 20% of anticipated funds for the next 5 years. This will provide equal opportunity to all projects and applicants overtime. Otherwise, it will limit allocations of future year projects by the amount exceeded.

It is noted that the requested percent allocations for Santa Clara River and Lower San Gabriel River watershed are 73% and 62% of anticipated funds in the next 5 years.



Public Comment Form

Name:* Annelisa Moe Organization*: Heal the Bay / OurWaterLA
Email*: amoe@healthebay.org Phone*: 7075404303
Meeting: 5/20 Regional Oversight Committee Date: 5/20/2020

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

NORTH SANTA MONICA BAY SIP

Support approval of this SIP. There were no projects to consider, and they chose not to fund the regional bacteria study. Only 5.4% of the funds were allocated for the next five years, and the only fund allocation was under the technical resources program to hire a watershed coordinator.

SANTA CLARA RIVER SIP

Neutral on approval of this SIP. There were two wet weather projects under consideration, both funded. These projects will capture stormwater and address nitrogen, zinc, and bacteria. The larger of the two projects provides DAC benefits, but neither project received any letters of support from the community. As currently assessed, the SCR SIP far exceeds its requirements for DAC benefits. The Regional Bacteria Study is not included in the SIP, and \$1.0M in total was allocated under the TRP to hire a watershed coordinator. They have allocated a total of 73% of their funds for the next five years. Although the two funded projects are good (not great) with aspects of nature based solutions and community investments, OWLA remains neutral on this SIP due to the high allocation of funds and lack of community support letters.

LOWER SAN GABRIEL RIVER SIP

Support approval of this SIP. Seven projects are included in this SIP, all previously vetted through the IRWM process. 3 are dry weather diversions, and the other four are wet weather projects that address zinc and bacteria. Only two of these projects received community support letters (unclear who sent them). All but one of these projects claims DAC benefits, so as currently assessed, this SIP far exceeds its requirements for DAC benefits. The Regional Bacteria Study is not included in the SIP, and \$1.0M in total was allocated under the TRP to hire a watershed coordinator. They

Date: May 19, 2020

To: Shelley Luce, Chair
Regional Oversight Committee, Safe Clean Water Program

cc: Matt Frary

From: Belinda Faustinos, Member
Regional Oversight Committee, Safe Clean Water Program

RE: Ex Parte Communications

I attended, led or contributed to the following in person/telephone/video meetings regarding the SCWP

Date	Parties	Regarding
March 4	Omar Gomez, N4A staff	workplan for OWLA organizers
March 5	Water Leaders, OWLA Members, Estolano Advisors (roster on file)	Completed and upcoming WACS mtgs
March 10	OWLA Core Team Members, CNRG	WASC meeting protocols
March 11	Belinda Represented OWLA, self (resident)	Rio Hondo WASC Meeting
March 17	OWLA Core Team Members	OWLA Recommendations RE SCWP
March 25	Same as above	SCWP
March 26	Mtg with OWLA, FCD, Board staff	SCWP
April 7	Mtg with OWLA, FCD	SCWP
April 8	Mtg with FCD Staff	SCWP
April 21	OWLA Core Team Members	SCWP
May 4	USGR WASC	OWLA Recommendations
May 5	LSGR WASC	OWLA Recommendations
May 6	Rio Hondo WASC	OWLA Recommendations
May 7	Water Leaders, OWLA Members, Estolano Advisors	Completed and upcoming WASC mtgs.
May 8	OWLA Core Team Members	OWLA Recommendations RE SCWP
May 12	SGV COG Water Committee Meeting	SCWP
May 18	USGR WASC	SCWP
May 19	OWLA Core Team Members	OWLA Recommendations RE SCWP
May 19	N4A staff, City of Monrovia & Craft Engineering	Rio Hondo RWMP Project Review