

Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District
Comments on
Assembly Water Bond Working Group
2013 Water Bond Framework Public Review Draft (dated Aug. 14)
August 21, 2013

- 1) We appreciate the inclusion of several categories of funding that are responsive to our August 1st comments, as well as the proposed funding level of \$1 billion for clean and safe drinking water. Specifically, we support inclusion in the Framework of funding for wastewater treatment facilities under Water Quality, and the identification of salinity in the list of contaminants eligible for funding. In addition to those identified, we believe that numerous other contaminants should also be included on the list and/or that the list should be considered to be examples, and the bond should not identify an exclusive list of contaminants for which funding would be available. The regulations for drinking water and clean water (which affects stormwater and wastewater) change all the time and new contaminants are identified as problems on a regular basis, and the funding measure should be flexible enough to be able to address new water quality concerns as they emerge. If this is to be an exhaustive list, other contaminants that should be included on the list include ammonia, bacteria and n-nitrosodimethylamine (NDMA).
- 2) We appreciate the inclusion of water quality in the category of funding dedicated to Protecting Rivers, Lakes, Streams and Watersheds.
- 3) We also support the inclusion of funding for Integrated Regional Water Management for a broad range of activities including water recycling and water conservation, as well as stormwater capture.
- 4) While we support the inclusion of regional funding allocations, we believe it may be appropriate to divide the Los Angeles Funding Area into two separate funding areas for LA and Ventura Counties.
- 5) We have a comment regarding the general provisions that relates to the intent to retain assurances such as the prohibition on funding environmental mitigation. The existing bond language (SB 2 x7) contains the following provision:

“79711. Funds provided by this division shall not be expended to support or pay for the costs of environmental mitigation measures or compliance obligations of any party except as part of the environmental mitigation costs of projects financed by this division or for costs for groundwater cleanup pursuant to the requirements of Chapter 10 (commencing with Section 79770). Funds provided by this division may be used for environmental enhancements or other public benefits.”

We request that the phrase “or compliance obligations of any party” not be included because funding for clean and safe drinking water is likely to be linked to meeting regulatory or compliance obligations. We oppose inclusion of a specific limitation like this, since it would undermine the stated intent of providing funds for these purposes.

- 6) We have a concern about the intent stated in the General Provisions regarding termination of authorization for water bond funds not yet appropriated. This should not include Proposition 84 funds, particularly those intended for the IRWM program, since the voters have already approved this funding, and IRWMP groups have been waiting for years for these funds to be appropriated by the Legislature. We believe that the main reason those funds have not been appropriated and expended is because of the poor economy that prevented the State from selling more bonds for several years. Project proponents should not be penalized for this problem, since waiting for a new water bond to pass and for new appropriations to occur will only delay many projects. Therefore, we only support termination of authorization where there is truly a determination that the purpose of the funding is no longer valid or necessary.