

Meeting Minutes:

Thursday, March 12, 2020 10:00am - 12:30pm Las Virgenes Municipal Water District 4232 Las Virgenes Road, Calabasas, CA 91302

Attendees

<u>Committee Members Present:</u> David Pedersen (LVMWD) Dave Roberts (LVMWD) Madelyn Glickfeld (UCLA) Cung Nguyen (LA County Flood Control District) David Rydman (LA County – Waterworks District) Tevin Schmitt (WCFVC)

<u>Committee Members Not Present:</u> Doug Marian (CA Plumbing & Mechanical) Chad Christensen (MRCA) Jessica Duboff (LA Area Chamber of Commerce) Kirsten James (Resident) Alex Farassati (Calabasas) Joe Bellomo* (Hidden Hills) Bruce Hamamoto (LA County) Shea Cunningham (Malibu)

Nathan Hamburger (Agoura Hills) Jessica Arden (Westlake Village) Katy Yaroslavsky (LA County Supervisor District 3)

*Committee Member Alternate

See attached sign-in sheet for full list of attendees

1. Welcome and Introductions

David Pedersen, 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 February 27, 2020

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

Dave Roberts made a motion to approve the meeting minutes. Cung Nguyen seconded the motion. The Committee voted to approve the meeting minutes (unanimous).

3. Committee Member and District Updates

Kirk Allen provided updates from the District, noting: a public draft of the fund Transfer Agreement is now open for review, and will close on April 7; the second-round call for projects will close on July 31; release of statement of qualifications is expected the first week of April, with solicitations due in late May.

David Pederson noted that a meeting of all WASC chairs took place to discuss: development of the Stormwater Investment Plans (SIPs); to share potential challenges each of the WASCs are facing; and to share information about other WASCs.

4. Public Comment Period

No public comments received.

5. Discussion Items

a) Ex Parte Communications Disclosure

No members had ex parte communications to disclose.

b) Feasibility Study Guidelines – Project Scoring Criteria Concerns

The committee discussed concerns with how the project scoring criteria made it a challenge to apply for funding within the NSMB watershed. Members suggested criteria be updated to accommodate watersheds that are unable to provide stormwater supply benefits. Madelyn Glickfeld volunteered to provide written update recommendations for the scoring criteria and suggested that a recommendation to update scoring criteria be added to the agenda to the next WASC meeting.

c) Discuss protocol for initial WASC review of new Infrastructure Program projects prior to submission to the Scoring Committee for future rounds of Call for Projects.

Kirk Allen provided a summary of the WASC role that allows committee members to have a preliminary discussion and preview projects before they are scored. Some projects may not fit the goals of the SCW Program, or the goals of the Watershed Area and may be held from scoring.

The Committee discussed challenges with how projects are unable to be modified after submission and scoring. Suggestions were proposed to allow some level of flexibility to modify project submissions to meet requests by the WASCs, or to allow applicants to take a smaller portion of SCW funding than was originally requested.

d) Discuss regional project ideas and partnerships with Caltrans and Metro for the NSMB Watershed Area

Madelyn Glickfeld noted that this item should be a working item for all members to foster partnerships with outside agencies to develop multi-benefit partner projects. The Committee discussed potential partnership agencies that may be reached out or invited to attend the NSMB WASC meetings to consider SCW partner projects.

6. Voting Items

a) Designate an allocation of \$100,000 for Watershed Coordinator services in the Technical Resources Program budget of the Fiscal Year 2020-21 Stormwater Investment Plan for the NSMB Watershed Area

Alex Farassati made a motion to approve the voting item. Madelyn Glickfeld seconded the motion.

The Committee discussed the time commitment provided by the Watershed Coordinator and how a half time position would be utilized for the NSMB Watershed Area.

The Committee voted to approve the voting item (unanimous).

b) Consideration of whether to fund the NSMB portion of the Scientific Studies Program submittal, Regional Scientific Study to Support Protection of Human Health through Targeted Reduction of Bacteriological Pollution, in the budget of the Fiscal Year 2020-21 Stormwater Investment Plan for the NSMB Watershed Area.

The committee discussed potential concerns and issues with the Bacteriological Pollution study. Concerns were raised with the technical capabilities of the project applicant to conduct the study, as

Safe, Clean Water Program North Santa Monica Bay Watershed Area Steering Committee (WASC)



well as concerns with the potential of the study reducing regulatory requirements. Madelyn Glickfeld suggested that the WASC focus on pilot projects over these types of scientific studies for the NSMB Watershed Area.

Tevin Schmitt made a motion to reject the voting item. Madelyn Glickfeld seconded the motion to reject the voting item.

The Committee voted to reject the voting item:

- In Favor (9)
 - Joé Bellomo
 - o David Pedersen
 - o Dave Roberts
 - Madelyn Glickfeld
 - Cung Nguyen
 - David Rydman
 - Tevin Schmitt
 - o Kirsten James
 - Bruce Hamamoto
 - Opposed (0)
- Abstain (2)
 - Shea Cunningham
 - Alex Farassati

c) Confirm final Fiscal Year 2020-21 Stormwater Investment Plan for the NSMB Watershed Area and approve submission to the Regional Oversight Committee for review.

Madelyn Glickfeld made a motion to approve the voting item. Dave Rydman seconded the motion.

The Committee discussed how fund phasing will work for the first year and future year funding for development of the SIP. David Pederson requested that the zero-dollar allocations/projections for the NSMB SIP should include a note that additional work will be conducted next year to develop a 5-year SIP.

The Committee voted to approve (unanimous).

7. Items for next agenda

The Committee requested recommendations and comments for updates to the scoring criteria be provided on the next meeting agenda.

Madelyn Glickfeld requested that a municipal report on intent to apply for the second round of projects be added on the next meeting agenda.

8. Next meeting duration

The committee decided to keep the meeting duration the same.

9. Adjournment

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



DATE: March 10, 2020

TO: WASC Chair & Members CC: LAC SCWP Staff

RE: OurWaterLA Recommendations Concerning the Watershed Area Stormwater Investment Plan for 2019-2020

OurWaterLA (OWLA) is a diverse coalition that has engaged communities, businesses, and organizations across Los Angeles County, building support to reinvent and reinvest in our water future using nature based infrastructure that provides community health benefits, environmental health benefits, and economic benefits. OWLA recommends that funding priority be given to the projects that best exemplify the goals of the Safe, Clean Water Program (SCWP), and that consideration should be given to reserving future funds for future exemplary projects.

FUNDING ALLOCATION FOR STORMWATER PROJECTS

The Stormwater Investment Plans (SIPs) must achieve the fourteen programmatic goals clearly laid out in the SCWP Implementation Ordinacne (Attachment 1), including the goals to improve water quality and contribute to attainment of water-quality requirements, as well as multiple additional community investments such as prioritization of nature based solutions, community engagement, equity, and quality jobs. Our top issues are shown below in bullet point format and described more robustly in Attachment 1.

Nature Based Solutions

The prioritization of nature based solutions is a specific programmatic goal of the SCWP, and therefore must be reflected in the projects for the SIP.

Community Engagement

A plan for future community outreach is not sufficient for true community engagement in a project. Priority should be given to projects for which <u>local</u> community engagement, designed specifically for the proposed project, has already been initiated.

Equity

One of the most innovative aspects of the SCWP is the written requirements for the equitable distribution of community investments. When assessing the 110% benefit return on investments

for disadvantaged communities, it is important to clarify what type of benefits a project provides, and whether the proposed investments directly benefit the receiving community and verified by local community groups.

Quality Jobs

At a minimum, funding through the SCWP SIP must be contingent upon providing direct community investments, such as high quality local job and training opportunities.

We recommend that all of these programmatic goals be considered when selecting projects for full or partial funding for the 2019-2020 SIP, and that consideration be given to reserving future funds for future exemplary projects. One opportunity to reserve future funding is to fund projects in phases, to get projects through initial project development, such as project design.

FUNDING ALLOCATION FOR SCIENTIFIC STUDIES

There have also been proposals for funding through the SCWP Scientific Studies Program. The purpose of the Scientific Studies Program is to provide funding for scientific and technical activities, including, but not limited to, scientific studies, technical studies, monitoring, and modeling related to *stormwater and urban runoff capture and pollution reduction*.

OWLA recommends that no funding be allocated for the Regional Scientific Study to Support Protection of Human Health through Targeted Reduction of Bacteriological Pollution. We have serious concerns about the legitimacy of this proposed study. It has no hypothesis or clear methodology, and no scientific professionals were involved in the development of the study, as is required under the SCWP Scientific Studies Program when feasible.

This proposal is asking for nearly \$10 million region-wide over the next five years to target a specific source of a specific pollutant rather than providing multiple benefits, and to potentially weaken water quality objectives rather than improving our water quality. This proposed study will not support many of the program goals, listed in Attachment 1. Additionally, 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. *This nearly \$10 million should be spent to invest in our communities with multi-benefit stormwater capture projects.*

Further, for those WASCs considering the Wet Weather Zinc study, this proposal is asking for \$500K to potentially weaken water quality objectives, rather than improving our water quality. Funds should instead be spent on multi-benefit stormwater capture projects. The Safe, Clean Water Program is not 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 ways to achieve this type of recalculation, including working with the State Water Resources Control Board. Thank you all for the considerable time and effort that you have contributed to the implementation of the Safe, Clean Water Program. We look forward to continuing our collaborative work with each of you, with the County of Los Angeles, and with our communities to most efficiently and effectively reinvest in our water future. Many of us, including WASC members, recognize that this is a complex process, and we would be remiss not to stop and strongly re-evaluate the context for making these critically important funding recommendations. OWLA core team members want to work with you to be part of the solution for meeting water quality standards by implementing multi-benefit projects. Thank you for your consideration of these recommendations.

Sincerely,

OWLA Core Team

ATTACHMENT 1

Safe, Clean Water Program Implementation Ordinance: Section 18.04 SCW Program Goals.

A. Improve water quality and contribute to attainment of water-quality requirements.

B. Increase drought preparedness by capturing more Stormwater and/orUrban Runoff to store, clean, reuse, and/or recharge groundwater basins.

C. Improve public health by preventing and cleaning up contaminated water, 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.

D. Leverage other funding sources to maximize SCW Program Goals.

E. Invest in infrastructure that provides multiple benefits.

F. Prioritize Nature-Based Solutions.

G. Provide a spectrum of project sizes from neighborhood to regional scales.

H. Encourage innovation and adoption of new technologies and practices.

I. Invest in independent scientific research.

J. Provide DAC Benefits, including Regional Program infrastructure investments, that are not less than one hundred and ten percent (110%) of the ratio of the DAC population to the total population in each Watershed Area.

K. Provide Regional Program infrastructure funds benefiting each Municipality in proportion to the funds generated within their jurisdiction, after accounting for allocation of the one hundred and ten percent (110%) return to DACs, to the extent feasible.

L. Implement an iterative planning and evaluation process to ensure adaptive management.

M. Promote green jobs and career pathways.

N. Ensure ongoing operations and maintenance for Projects.