



# Mar Vista Community Council



## Green Committee

Saturday, March 26, 2016 - 9:30 A.M.

### Grand View Market

12210 Venice Blvd  
Los Angeles, CA 90066

## Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Motion to approve March minutes
3. Public comment
4. Eco Car Expo
  - To-date report
  - Publicity
  - Day of planning: setup, logistics, signs, etc.
5. New business
  - a. Policy Motion: Resolution In Support Of Mayor Garcetti's Sustainable City Plan Goal For Local Solar Power

WHEREAS, Los Angeles receives more than 250 days of sunshine per year and has enough rooftop space to hold 5,500 MW of solar power; 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, A severe earthquake could cause LA to be without power for two weeks or more, making distributed energy generation and storage especially important; and

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

WHEREAS, SB 32, signed into law on October 11, 2009, requires LADWP to make a tariff available to eligible renewable electric generation facilities within its service territory, until LADWP meets its 75 MW share of the statewide target;

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 Mayor to stand behind and take whatever actions needed to support the goal of 1,500 MW of local solar PV by 2025 as a *baseline* target, with a strong effort to surpass this goal, in accordance with the current Sustainable City pLAN or any subsequent revisions.
6. Public comment
7. 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](mailto: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](mailto:chair@marvista.org)*



IMAGE BY MATTHEW FIELD / COMMONS.WIKIMEDIA.ORG

# 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](http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/california)



ATTACHMENT B: October, 2013, MVCC Policy Motion



**Mar Vista  
Community Council**

Web: [www.MarVista.org](http://www.MarVista.org)  
P.O. Box 66871  
Mar Vista, CA 90066  
[info@marvista.org](mailto:info@marvista.org)

**Officers 2012-2013  
Chair**

Sharon Commins  
[smcommins@marvista.org](mailto:smcommins@marvista.org)

**1<sup>st</sup> Vice Chair**

Bill Koontz  
[billk@marvista.org](mailto:billk@marvista.org)

**2<sup>nd</sup> Vice Chair**

Yvette Molinaro  
[yvette.molinaro@marvista.org](mailto:yvette.molinaro@marvista.org)

**Secretary**

Bill Duckett  
[bduckett@marvista.org](mailto:bduckett@marvista.org)

**Treasurer**

Bill Scheduling  
[wls@MarVista.org](mailto: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, 11<sup>th</sup> District City of Los Angeles [mike.bonin@lacity.org](mailto:mike.bonin@lacity.org)  
The Honorable Paul Koretz, Councilmember, 5<sup>th</sup> District, City of Los Angeles [paul.koretz@lacity.org](mailto:paul.koretz@lacity.org)

**Cc:** Len Nguyen, Field Deputy, CD11 [len.nguyen@lacity.org](mailto:len.nguyen@lacity.org)  
Andy Schrader, Deputy of Environmental Affairs and Sustainability CD 5 [andy.schrader@lacity.org](mailto: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](mailto:smcommins@marvista.org)