



Mar Vista Community Council



Green Committee

Sunday February 28, 2016 - 9:30 A.M.

Mar Vista Farmers Market

Grand View at Venice Blvd.

Tables Adjacent to the Post Office

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Motion to approve January minutes
3. Public comment
4. Reports
 - a. MVCC Green Tent
 - b. Eco Car Expo
5. Discussion
 - a. MVCC membership in NCSA (possible motion to follow)
 - b. How can Mar Vista Support the LA/CA/US/Paris greenhouse gas emission reduction goals?
 - Possible motion RE 350.org global demonstration May 7-15 (<http://breakfree2016.org>)
 - Methane crisis
6. Old business
 - a. Eco Car Expo publicity funding
7. New business
 - a. Policy Motion: Bay-Delta Conservation Plan

Whereas the Bay-Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP), "Twin Tunnels," or "California Water Fix" is an effort to build twin tunnels to divert the Sacramento River primarily for the benefit of corporate agribusiness.

Whereas the tunnels won't deliver any new water to Los Angeles, are estimated to cost between \$25 and \$67 billion (approximately \$1.6 to 10 billion Los Angeles share), and would actually undermine Los Angeles' water security, the creation of thousands of local jobs, and would benefit special interests at the expense of Los Angeles ratepayers. Already MWD has taken from LA taxpayers upwards of 300 million intended for tunnels construction, and Mayor Garcetti appointees have voted in support of these motions.

Whereas the twin tunnels would siphon billions we need to support Mayor Garcetti's goals for a more self-sufficient and reliable water system in LA. Mayor Garcetti's Emergency Drought Directive calls for reducing our dependence on imported water, and increasing local water supply sources such as storm water, replenishing groundwater aquifers, and recycled water. As Garcetti's directive states, imported water is not only exponentially more expensive than local water sources, but is at immediate and long term risk because of impacts from climate change and the drought. As these necessary investments are estimated to be over \$2 billion, ratepayer money should not be wasted on constructing new tunnels that would primarily benefit special interests.

Be it resolved, that the Mar Vista Community Council opposes the Bay-Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP),

“Twin Tunnels,” or “California Water Fix” and any effort to divert the Sacramento River.

Be it further resolved that we urge Mayor Eric Garcetti to take action to ensure that ratepayers aren’t harmed, specifically by directing his appointees at the Metropolitan Water District (MWD) to vote no on any measure that would spend ratepayer or taxpayer money on the tunnels.

Background Information:

- Attachment A: Food and Water Watch article
- Attachment B: Prior MVCC motion

b. Policy Motion: Resolution In Support Of Mayor Garcetti’s Sustainable City Plan Goal For Local Solar Power

Introduction

WHEREAS, in 2013 the State of California emitted roughly 350 million metric tons of carbon-dioxide; and

WHEREAS, solar power is a clean source of energy Californians can use to power their homes and businesses to reduce pollution, improve air quality, and decrease the threat of global warming; and

WHEREAS, solar power has tripled in the U.S. in the last two years and increased by 237 percent in California between 2012 and 2014, with another American family or business going solar every four minutes; and

WHEREAS, the price of solar has dropped more than 50 percent since 2011; and

WHEREAS, more people are employed by the solar industry in California than in any other state, with more the 75,000 Californians working in the solar industry in 2015, a 38 percent increase over 2014; and

WHEREAS, with over 250 days of sunshine a year and over 10,000 acres of rooftop solar potential, Los Angeles has one of the highest capacities for local solar power in the United States; and

Environmental Benefits

WHEREAS, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) concluded with 95 percent certainty that anthropogenic carbon pollution is causing global temperatures to rise, exacerbating extreme weather events such as droughts, floods, and wildfires; and

WHEREAS, burning fossil fuels releases carbon, while solar energy production does not; and

WHEREAS, the Clean Energy and Pollution Reduction Act of 2015 requires that the amount of electricity generated and sold to retail customers in California from eligible renewable energy resources be increased to 50 percent by December 31, 2030; and

WHEREAS, the City of San Diego committed in December 2015 to achieving 100 percent renewable energy by 2035, demonstrating remarkable leadership along with confidence in the environmental, economic, and health benefits of clean, local energy; and

WHEREAS, Governor Brown declared a state of emergency in January, 2014 due to severe drought conditions and mandated a 25 percent reduction in water consumption across California; and

WHEREAS, producing one kilowatt-hour of energy from solar photovoltaic (PV) systems requires approximately one-ninth as much water as producing one kilowatt-hour from a combined cycle fossil gas plant, and one seventeenth as much as from a coal-fired plant; and

Economic Benefits

WHEREAS, solar PV creates local jobs that benefit both the economy and the health of the community; and

WHEREAS, solar job growth was up 38 percent statewide in 2015, providing 20,000 new jobs for Californians in 2015 alone; and

WHEREAS, the average payback time of a residential solar system is 6-9 years, while the average lifespan of a system is 25 years, meaning solar PV not only pays for itself, but generates a profit as well; and

WHEREAS, if the market price of fossil fuels took into account all the negative health risks and damage to the environment they caused, they would be far more expensive; and

Health Benefits

WHEREAS, in 2015, the American Lung Association ranked the Los Angeles-Long Beach metropolitan area as the most polluted city in the country for ozone pollution, a greenhouse gas that irritates the lungs and increases the risk of bronchitis, asthma, and worsens lung and heart disease; and

WHEREAS, Los Angeles County's levels of ozone were out of compliance with federal Clean Air Act limits 83 days in 2015; and

WHEREAS, over 205,000 children—more than half of them Latino—and over 670,000 adults were living with asthma in Los Angeles in 2015 and are thus at increased risk from both ozone and particle pollution; and

WHEREAS, fossil fuel-burning power plants release toxic pollutants, including mercury, acid gases, and particulates, that damage the health of local residents, as well as greenhouse gases; and

WHEREAS, anthropogenic climate change, intensified by fossil fuels, creates serious negative health effects in the form of droughts, heat waves, and more extreme weather; and

WHEREAS, solar PV does not release toxic substances during electricity production; and

Los Angeles's Role

WHEREAS, the City of Los Angeles is the largest in California and the second largest in the nation; and

WHEREAS, Los Angeles has the capacity for over 5,500 megawatts (MW) of rooftop solar PV;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Mar Vista Community Council supports the pro-solar principles espoused in Mayor Garcetti's Sustainable City pLAN and urges the city to achieve 1,500 MW of local solar PV by 2025 as a *baseline* target, with a strong effort to surpass this goal.

8. Public comment

9. Adjournment

**in compliance with Government Code section 54957.5, non-exempt writings that are distributed to a majority or all of the committee members in advance of a meeting, may be viewed at <http://www.marvista.org> or at the scheduled meeting. In addition, if you would like a copy of any record related to an item on the agenda, please contact secretary@marvista.org.*

***As a covered entity under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Los Angeles does not discriminate on the basis of disability and upon request, will provide reasonable accommodation to ensure equal access to its programs, services, and activities. Sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or any auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability of services, please make your request at least 3 business days prior to the meeting you wish to attend by contacting chair@marvista.org*

ATTACHMENT A: Food and Water Watch Article

The Water Tunnels and Los Angeles

What is the BDCP/Peripheral Tunnels project?

The Water Tunnels are a \$20–50 billion plan to build two massive 35-mile tunnels to divert the Sacramento River in order to increase water exports from the San Francisco Bay Delta. Not only has Governor Brown proposed the plan, but

he has been given the sole power to approve the project by the State Legislature. The project is nearly identical to the peripheral canal proposal of 1982, which was rejected by voters in a statewide referendum.

Who would get the water?

The Kern County Water Agency and the Westlands Water District, which represent California's most powerful corporate agribusinesses, would receive the majority of the water from the tunnels. These interests export water-intensive crops such as cotton and almonds, and sell taxpayer-subsidized water, originally intended for farming, for private profit.

In addition, the Metropolitan Water District (MWD), which imports water from the Bay-Delta and sells it to cities across southern California, also wants more water. However, Los Angeles and Long Beach are actually planning to buy less imported water from the MWD, and Santa Monica is planning to eliminate its water purchases from the MWD altogether in favor of more cost-effective local water-supply options.

Who would pay for these tunnels?

Water ratepayers in southern California would be responsible for about 30 percent of the \$20–50 billion costs for construction and operation of the tunnels. Ratepayers in Los Angeles alone would see their water bills rise to pay their \$1.6–6 billion share for the tunnels. Corporate agricul-





IMAGE BY DAVID MONNIAUX / COMMONS.WIKIMEDIA.ORG

ture interests would also pay, but at a cheaper rate. Urban ratepayers and taxpayers already subsidize water for Westlands and Kern, and these tunnels would make that subsidy much larger. Finally, California taxpayers would be on the hook for \$3–5 billion for clean-up and mitigation costs from the tunnels.

Doesn't LA need more water from northern California?

Because of improved efficiency, LA actually uses less water today than it did 30 years ago, despite population growth of over 1 million people. Water use has dropped 15 percent in the last few years. The LA Department of Water and Power's (LADWP) water plan now calls for doubling local water-supply sources, fixing its aging infrastructure and reducing its purchases of imported water from the MWD. Thus, there is no need for more water from northern California.

What about drought and climate change?

Because periods of less rainfall are common in southern California, LA has an effective and proven plan that prioritizes the most important uses of water in a drought. About 40 percent of LA's water use is for outdoor irrigation, which is scaled back when there is less rainfall. In addition, both the LADWP and the MWD have invested billions in additional reserves, such as the Diamond Valley Lake. Finally, over 66 percent of all water exported from the Delta currently goes to agricultural uses, which could be made available for urban use if absolutely necessary. Should climate change result in new patterns of precipitation, local water

agencies will need to diversify their water portfolio by maximizing and retaining local sources of water.

What threat does a major earthquake pose to LA's water supply?

An earthquake in southern California is a severe threat to the LADWP's aging water system, which has over 1,000 water main breaks per year. Ratepayer dollars should be prioritized to fix and upgrade our pipes and treatment plants so they can be prepared for the next "big one." In addition, diversifying our water supply by increasing LA's groundwater and capturing stormwater will help preserve access to water after a big earthquake.

While an earthquake in northern California poses a much smaller risk, Westlands and the MWD are exaggerating an earthquake's potential to disrupt water exports from the Bay-Delta as a way to justify spending billions on the tunnels, masking the fact that they want more water for themselves at our expense.

Is this tunnel project the same project as the "Bay Delta Conservation Plan?" How will it affect the San Francisco Bay Delta?

Tunnel proponents have come up with the title BDCP as a way to mislead and confuse people about the tunnels. Diverting fresh water from the Sacramento River would have a devastating effect on the fragile San Francisco Bay Delta and its salmon populations, which nearly collapsed in 2008. That's why environmental groups and fishing groups across California strongly oppose these tunnels.

For more info and to get involved, visit:
www.foodandwaterwatch.org/california

ATTACHMENT B: October, 2013, MVCC Policy Motion



**Mar Vista
Community Council**

Web: www.MarVista.org
P.O. Box 66871
Mar Vista, CA 90066
info@marvista.org

**Officers 2012-2013
Chair**

Sharon Commins
smcommins@marvista.org

1st Vice Chair

Bill Koontz
billk@marvista.org

2nd Vice Chair

Yvette Molinaro
yvette.molinaro@marvista.org

Secretary

Bill Duckett
bduckett@marvista.org

Treasurer

Bill Scheduling
wls@MarVista.org

**Board of Directors
2012-2013**

Zone Directors

Zone 1

Ken Alpern

Zone 2

Bill Koontz

Zone 3

Kate Anderson

Zone 4

Michael Millman

Zone 5

Michelle Krupkin

Zone 6

Valerie Davidson

At-Large Directors

Sharon Commins

Bill Duckett

Yvette Molinaro

Mitchell Rishe

Melissa Stoller

Bill Scheduling

Community Director

John Kuchta



Certified Neighborhood Council
August 13, 2002

**OCTOBER 14, 2013
VIA EMAIL**

To: The Honorable Mike Bonin, Councilmember, 11th District City of Los Angeles mike.bonin@lacity.org
The Honorable Paul Koretz, Councilmember, 5th District, City of Los Angeles paul.koretz@lacity.org

Cc: Len Nguyen, Field Deputy, CD11 len.nguyen@lacity.org
Andy Schrader, Deputy of Environmental Affairs and Sustainability CD 5 andy.schrader@lacity.org

Re: BAY DELTA CONSERVATION PLAN/RATEPAYER ADVOCATE

Dear Councilmembers:

At the regularly scheduled meeting held October 8, 2013, The Mar Vista Community Council approved the following policy motion by a unanimous vote:

WHEREAS, the Office of Public Accountability (OPA) is a Los Angeles City department established by voter-approved Charter Amendment I (adopted March 8, 2011) in order to shed greater light on the Department of Water & Power's (DWP) operations and finances and to serve as an independent watchdog, charged with analyzing proposed increases in water and power rates on a timely and continuous basis; and

WHEREAS, the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta (Delta), the hub of California's water supply, is facing major challenges, including aging levees, seismic instability, increased urbanization, ecosystem degradation, a lack of fresh water, and a reduced and inconsistent annual snowpack and potential sea-level rise and flooding resulting from the climate crisis; and

WHEREAS, the City of Los Angeles purchases, on average, 50% of its water supply from the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD); 90% of the City's MWD water is from the Delta via the State Water Project (SWP); and

WHEREAS, the proposed Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) includes building at a cost of tens of billions of dollars, two 35-mile tunnels to divert a portion of the Sacramento River in a stated attempt to achieve a reliable water supply for California and a healthy Delta ecosystem. The City's ratepayers would be expected to contribute substantially to pay for the BDCP; and

WHEREAS, the DWP has previously announced a policy of purchasing less imported water and pursuing lower cost options of increasing the City's local water supply -- its Urban Water Management Plan includes taking the local water supply from 10% to 37% by 2035. These options include greater conservation, wastewater recycling, stormwater capture, grey water systems, new building and fixture standards, aquifer cleanup and infrastructure repair and maintenance. As the production of "local water" by the City will benefit the entire state, the costs should not fall exclusively upon the Los Angeles ratepayers; and

WHEREAS, in early August, 2013, the Brown Administration released a draft statewide economic report of costs and benefits of the BDCP. The Public Draft Plan of the BDCP is scheduled to be released in October. As of August 25, 2013, the City's Ratepayer Advocate has not yet released a report detailing the BDCP's impact upon the City's ratepayers;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that by adoption of this resolution, the Mar Vista Community Council respectfully requests that the Ratepayer Advocate provide an independent, peer-reviewed, cost-benefit analysis of the impact of the BDCP to Mar Vista ratepayers, including an analysis of the externalities -- environmental or otherwise, including the expansion of the local job market when building a local water supply -- involved in the BDCP, contrast these costs per acre foot with other sources of water, including efficiency-demand management, recycled water, stormwater capture and desalination; and publicly submit this analysis to the Mar Vista Community Council, the other Neighborhood Councils and the Los Angeles City Council for their consideration and comment before the BDCP moves forward.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of the matter,

Sharon Commins, Chair
Mar Vista Community Council
smcommins@marvista.org