

Safe, Clean Water Program

North Santa Monica Bay

Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC)



Meeting Minutes:

Thursday, February 27, 2020

10:00am - 12:00pm

Las Virgenes Municipal Water District

4232 Las Virgenes Road, Calabasas, CA 91302

Attendees

Committee Members Present:

Cung Nguyen (LA County Flood Control District)
David Rydman (LA County – Waterworks District)
Tevin Schmitt (Wishtoyo Chumash Foundation)
Kirsten James (Resident)
Nathan Hamburger (Aguora Hills)
Alex Farassati (Calabasas)
Joe Ballomo* (Hidden Hills)
Bruce Hamamoto* (LA County)

Shea Cunningham (Malibu)
Jessica Arden (Westlake Village)
Madelyn Glickfeld (UCLA)
Katy Yaroslavsky (LA County Supervisor District 3)
David Pedersen (LVMWD)
Chad Christensen (MRCA)
Jessica Duboff (LA Area Chamber of Commerce)

Committee Members Not Present:

Doug Marian (California Plumbing & Mechanical Contractors)

*Committee Member Alternate

See attached sign-in sheet for full list of attendees

1. Welcome and Introductions

David Pedersen, the Chair of the North Santa Monica Bay WASC, called the meeting to order.

All committee members made self-introductions, and quorum was established.

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes from January 30, 2020

The District provided a copy of the meeting minutes from the previous meeting.

Nathan Hamburger made a motion to approve the meeting minutes. Tevin Schmitt seconded the motion. The Committee voted to approve the meeting minutes from January 30, 2020 (unanimous).

3. Committee Member and District Updates

Kirk Allen provided updates from the District for the Scoring Committee, the progress so far for the development of the Watershed Coordinator RFSQ and the Municipal and Regional Transfer Agreements, the release of the General Income-Based Tax Reduction Program, and the availability of stipends for eligible committee members.

Kirk Allen noted that the District met with the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) to provide updates on the progress of the Safe, Clean Water Program. Renee Purdy of the RWQCB shared that the committee should be looking for the most impactful projects to drive compliance with the new MS4 Permit and committee members are welcome to attend RWQCB meeting on March 12th in the City of Pico Rivera to discuss the latest regional MS4 Permit under review.

Safe, Clean Water Program

North Santa Monica Bay

Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC)



Tori Klug of Stantec provided an overview of the Safe Clean Water (SCW) GIS tool developed by District Consultant Stantec.

Bruce Hamamoto noted that the Los Angeles County has withdrew the Viewridge Project from the current year's Infrastructure Program application and will reapply in the future year with a more proportionate funding request.

4. Public Comment Period

A member of the public noted that she has concerns related to the Regional Scientific Study to Support Protection of Heath Study (see attached public comment card).

5. Discussion Items

a) Ex Parte Communications Disclosure

Tevin Schmitt noted that he has a discussion with the Los Angeles County on Viewridge Project after the presentation to discuss monitoring and landscaping plans.

David Rydman noted that he and Shea Cunningham had a discussion on potential opportunities for cistern installations in residential area.

b) Strategic coordination for the NSMB WASC projects in consideration of limited annual funding available

Kirk Allen provided an overview of the North Santa Monica Bay anticipated funding and Technical Resources Program (TRP).

Committee discussed different options to fund TRP, including WC, with no Infrastructure Program (IP) projects. David Pedersen suggested that with the committee limited funds, it may be wise for municipalities to fund their own feasibility studies and apply for IP.

Kirsten James added that the deadline for next round of call for project submittals is July 31, 2020.

David Pedersen asked about how the Regional Program infrastructure investments will be evaluated in regard to the benefits to each municipality in the Watershed Area. Kirk Allen explained the detail and noted that it is to the extent feasible over a rolling 5-year period to ensure equity of benefits among the municipalities. David Pedersen noted that the committee may need to be flexible on this requirement.

Madelyn Glickfeld shared concerns about scoring criteria for this Watershed Area. David Pedersen suggested that this topic be discussed at the next meeting and that feedback from the committee should be shared with the District and Regional Oversight Committee.

Committee discussed potential Water Supply Benefit opportunities within the Watershed Area.

c) Discuss the Scientific Studies Program submittal and available budget (Regional Scientific Study to Support Protection of Human Health through Targeted Reduction of Bacteriological Pollution)

With limited funding, Kirsten James expressed concerns about its benefits versus just putting that money towards projects.

Safe, Clean Water Program

North Santa Monica Bay

Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC)



Tevin expressed his concerns about the goal of this study.

Katy Yaroslavsky and Madelyn Glickfeld suggested that committee may want to consider an independent agency such as Southern California Coastal Water Research Project (SCCWRP), to conduct and or review of proposals for Scientific Studies Program implementation in the future.

Bruce Hamamoto noted that this study will identify the most impactful bacteria on human health so agencies can properly focus their limited resources on it.

Kirsten James wanted to know what new information this study will bring and if this study aligned with the SCW goals.

David Pedersen shared his concerns about the cost and actionable outcome of this study and suggested that the committee be cautious when making decision.

A member of the public agreed that SCCWRP should be brought into the Scientific Studies Program.

Renee Purdy noted that the RWQCB had received presentation from the project applicant and this study itself would not be enough to change the water quality standard or regulations.

d) Discuss Scoring Committee review of Viewridge Road Stormwater Improvements Project

i) Additional discussion on aspects of the project

Alberto Grajeda of the Los Angeles County provided an overview of the project score.

Katy Yaroslavsky noted that even though the project had been withdrew from this year consideration, the County reapply in the future year with a more proportionate funding request.

ii) Review available budget and funding requested for project

None

e) Discuss the Technical Resources Program

i) Watershed Coordinator Budget for SIP consideration

Kirk Allen provided an overview of Watershed Coordinator (WC) roles and Request For Statement of Qualifications (RFSQ) process. Madelyn Glickfeld expressed some concerns that this committee won't be able to compete since a WC would be working half time for this Watershed Area. Alex Farassati shared that a half-time coordinator may be sufficient. Dave Rydman asked about the County contracting process versus having another entity who has in-house personnel take on such a role. It was recommended that any entity familiar with the Watershed Area with qualifying experience to submit a proposal during the open solicitation process.

Joe Ballomo asked if the awarded proposal would be a one-year contract. Kirk Allen responded that County contracts are initially just 1 year with up to 3 renewable option years should a WASC decide to retain their WC for subsequent years.

Safe, Clean Water Program

North Santa Monica Bay

Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC)



6. Voting Items

None

7. Items for next agenda

Madelyn recommended a discussion on Scoring Criteria.

Joe Bellomo recommended having a pre-meeting for feedback before sending new projects to the Scoring Committee. Kirk Allen agreed and noted that it is role of the Watershed Area Steering Committee to review the projects prior to sending to the Scoring Committee.

Katy Yaroslavsky recommended a discussion with Caltrans and Metro to explore project opportunities in this Watershed Area.

Meeting Schedule

- Duration: 10:00AM - 12:30PM (extended)
- Next Meeting: March 12, 2020 (held 2nd Thursday of each month moving forward)

8. Adjournment

David Pedersen thanked the committee members and public for their time and participation and adjourned the meeting.

North Santa Monica Bay
 Watershed Area Steering Committee Meeting
 COMMITTEE MEMBER AND ALTERNATE SIGN-IN



Member Name	Municipality/ Organization	Email Address		Signature
Cung Nguyen	FCD	CUNGUYEN@dpw.lacounty.gov	P	
Carolina Hernandez	FCD	CHERNANDEZ@dpw.lacounty.gov	A	
Dave Rydman	Los Angeles County-Waterworks District	drydman@dpw.lacounty.gov	P	
Greg Even	Los Angeles County-Waterworks District	GEVEN@dpw.lacounty.gov	A	
Chad Christensen	Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority	chad.christensen@mrca.ca.gov	P	
Sarah Rascon	Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority	sarah.rascon@mrca.ca.gov	A	
David Pedersen	Las Virgenes Municipal Water District	dpedersen@lvmwd.com	P	
Dave Roberts	Las Virgenes Municipal Water District	droberts@lvmwd.com	A	
Madelyn Glickfeld	Institute of the Environment and Sustainability UCLA	madelyn.glickfeld@ioes.ucla.edu	P	
Richard Ambrose	UCLA Fielding School of Public Health	rambrose@ucla.edu	A	
Doug Marian	California Plumbing and Mechanical Contractors	d.marian@uaplumber78.com	P	
Jessica Duboff	LA Area Chamber of Commerce	Jessica.Duboff@gmail.com	P	
Kendal Asuncion	LA Area Chamber of Commerce	kasuncion@lachamber.com	A	
Tevin Schmitt	Wishtoyo Chumash Foundation Ventura County	tschmitt@wishtoyo.org	P	
Kirsten James	Resident	kirstenjames@gmail.com	P	
Fran Diamond	Resident	mediafranh2o@gmail.com	A	

North Santa Monica Bay
 Watershed Area Steering Committee Meeting
 COMMITTEE MEMBER AND ALTERNATE SIGN-IN



Member Name	Municipality/ Organization	Email Address		Signature
Nathan Hamburger	Aguora Hills	Nhamburger@ci.agoura-hills.ca.us	P	
Louis Celaya	Aguora Hills	Lcelaya@ci.agoura-hills.ca.us	A	
Alex Farassati	Calabasas	afarassati@cityofcalabasas.com	P	
Alba Lemus	Calabasas	alemus@cityofcalabasas.com	A	
Kerry Kallman	Hidden Hills	kerry@hiddenhillscity.org	P	
Joe Bellomo	Hidden Hills	jbello@willdan.com	A	
Katy Yaroslavsky	LA County Supervisor District 3	kyaroslavsky@bos.lacounty.gov	P	
Virdiana Velez	LA County Supervisor District 3	vvelez@bos.lacounty.gov	A	
Paul Alva	Los Angeles County	PALVA@dpw.lacounty.gov	P	
Mark Lombos	Los Angeles County	MLOMBOS@dpw.lacounty.gov	A	
Bruce Hamamoto	Los Angeles County	BHAMAMO@dpw.lacounty.gov	A	✓
Shea Cunningham	Malibu	scunningham@malibucity.org	P	
Mark Johnson	Malibu	mjohnson@malibucity.org	A	
Jessica Arden	Westlake Village	jessica@wlv.org	P	
Phillipe Eskandar	Westlake Village	philippe@wlv.org	A	

North Santa Monica Bay
 Watershed Area Steering Committee Meeting
 PUBLIC SIGN-IN



First Name	Last Name	Municipality/Organization	Email Address
Michael Omary	OMARY	APD Clean Water Tech	info@cleanwatertech.com
TORI KLUG	KLUG	Stantec	tori.klug@stantec.com
Annelisa MOE	Moe	Heal the Bay	amoe@healthebay.org
Persephone St Charles	St Charles	Woodard+Curran	pstcharles@woodardcurran.com
Brenda PONTAN	Pontan	Woodard+Curran	bpontan@woodardcurran.com
Kirston			
Renee Purdy	Purdy	RWCB	Renee.Purdy@waterboards.ca.gov
Kelsey Reed	Reed	Westlake Village	kreed@willdan.com
Alberto Grijala	Grijala	DPW	algrijala@dpw.lacounty.gov
Maura MARTINEZ	Martinez	Agoura Hills (Willdan)	mmartinez@willdan.com

*Signing or completing this form is voluntary for members of the public



Public Comment Form

Name: Annelisa Moe Organization: Heal the Bay
Email: amoe@healthebay.org Phone: ~~714~~ 310-451-1500 x115
Meeting: North SMB WASC Date: 2/27/2020

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

Comments

Agenda Item 5.c.
See attachment for full comments

To review the guidance documents and for more information, visit www.SafeCleanWaterLA.org

Comments can be mailed to: ATTN: Safe, Clean Water Program
LA County Public Works
P.O. Box 1460
Alhambra, CA 91802-1460

The Regional Scientific Study to Support Protection of Human Health through Targeted Reduction of Bacteriological Pollution

OWLA RECOMMENDATIONS – The Basics

- ❖ This proposal is not a legitimate scientific study. It has no hypothesis or clear methodology, and no scientific professionals were involved in the development of the study, as is required under this Program. It should not be considered for funding through the SCWP Scientific Studies Program.
- ❖ This proposal is asking for ~\$10M over the next five years to weaken water quality objectives, rather than improving our water quality. This ~\$10M should be spent on multi-benefit stormwater capture projects.
- ❖ The Safe, Clean Water Program is not be the right funding source for this study because this study does not support many of the goals of the Safe, Clean Water Program or its Scientific Studies Program.
- ❖ There are other potential funding sources for this study including the Stormwater Monitoring Coalition, which already has a similar study in its 5-year plan.

OWLA RECOMMENDATIONS – A Little Extra Detail

- ❖ This proposal is not a true scientific study. It has no hypothesis or clear methodology, and no scientific professionals were involved in the development of the study. It should not be considered for funding through the SCWP Scientific Studies Program.
 - This goes directly against the purpose of the Scientific Studies Program, which states “The Scientific Studies Program shall be administered by the District and, to the extent feasible, shall utilize independent research institutions or academic institutions to carry out Scientific Studies or to help design and peer review Scientific Studies carried out by other entities.”
 - An LA River study found human markers everywhere. How will human source identification happen if there is human marker everywhere? Clear methodology must be laid out in the study proposal. Otherwise, we are earmarking money for the promise of result, with no clear plan of how those results will be achieved.
- ❖ This proposal is asking for ~\$10M over the next five years to weaken water quality objectives, rather than improving our water quality. This ~\$10M should be spent on multi-benefit stormwater capture projects.
 - For decades, stormwater has been a major source of contamination in our waters because cities claimed they did not have the funding necessary to implement stormwater capture projects.
 - Now cities are claiming that W funding will not be enough on its own to capture and clean enough of our stormwater. However, by leveraging funding, and spending this money wisely (on projects to achieve water quality standards, rather than studies attempting to weaken those standards), we can do a whole lot with this new source of funding.
 - So let’s spend this money on what it was meant for – investing in stormwater capture projects that are known to reduce bacteria and other pollutant loads, while also providing multiple other benefits to our communities.
- ❖ The Safe, Clean Water Program is not be the right funding source for this study because this study does not support many of the goals of the Safe, Clean Water Program or its Scientific Studies Program, including:
 - Increase drought preparedness by capturing more Stormwater and/or Urban Runoff to store, clean, reuse, and/or recharge groundwater basins.

- Improve public health by increasing access to open space, providing additional recreational opportunities, and helping communities mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change through activities such as increasing shade and green space.
- Leverage other funding sources to maximize SCW Program Goals
- Invest in infrastructure that provides multiple benefits.
- Prioritize Nature-Based Solutions
- Utilize independent research institutions or academic institutions to carry out Scientific Studies
- ❖ Other potential funding sources for this study:
 - Stormwater Monitoring Coalition
 - In fact, this study is already proposed in the Stormwater Monitoring Coalition's 5-year plan, and should be funded by responsible agencies through this coalition, as originally planned.
 - State Water Board
 - Regional Water Board
 - CASQA
 - Partnerships with NGOs or academics, etc.
- ❖ AS A POTENTIAL COMPROMISE (let's not say this yet, but hold this in our back pocket for future discussion): This could alternatively be a pilot study in a single WASC area to begin with, starting with an initial phase as proof of concept before ~10M is earmarked for this study.