



September 11, 2017

Councilmember Nury Martinez
Chair, Energy, Climate Change and Environmental Justice Committee
200 N. Spring St.
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Subject: Council File #17-0930, Support for California WaterFix

Dear Chairwoman Martinez:

On behalf of Central City Association of Los Angeles, I would like to express our organization's continued support for the California WaterFix program.

Established in 1924, CCA is LA's premier advocacy organization, with over 400 members in the Los Angeles region. As an economic and cultural center and a destination for 500,000 workers each day and millions of visitors per year, our community and our members depend on clean and reliable water sources, and they wish to see those supplies generated and conveyed in an efficient and environmentally sustainable way.

California WaterFix will provide the state—and our city—with a clear approach to water quality, ecosystem restoration, and climate change adaptation, all while ensuring that 25 million residents and 3 million acres of farmland have an adequate water supply. It is the long-term, sustainable solution that California needs to increase our resilience to drought and other climate impacts, and to boost our economy through direct job creation and support for businesses across the state.


At the local level, reports by the Department of Water and Power as well as the Ratepayer Advocate have confirmed that the average household cost of WaterFix will fall in the range of \$2 per household per month. These same reports have also analyzed other investments in water quality and resilience and determined that the cost of these alternatives could be double or triple that of WaterFix, if not more. However, local investments are also essential, and will be an integral part of a complete regional water reliability solution. CCA believes that such investments are complements to WaterFix, not competitors.

As many others have argued, the WaterFix project is essentially an insurance policy for our region. With WaterFix in place, we are able to continue investing in local improvements without fearing the worst from threats of drought, climate change, or natural disaster. We can and should continue to support water recapture, storage, and recycling, but the Bay Delta provides us with a critical backstop to get through a prolonged drought or a natural disaster, where local measures can't always substitute for imports.

We understand that the Committee members are concerned that their constituents have limited funds available for water infrastructure (or any other major expenditures), and that priorities must be set. CCA shares this concern, and it is why we're pleased that the cost-sharing structure of WaterFix still incentivizes improvements to our local water infrastructure and continued reductions in water demand. If Los Angeles' imported water use falls as a result of heavy precipitation, improved recapture and recycling, and/or reduced demand, the average cost to customers will fall significantly. If the worst comes to pass and another 5-or-more-year drought strikes, however, our residents and businesses can rest easy that the water will continue to flow.

CCA appreciates the Committee's efforts to find the best path forward for the City, and we welcome this careful analysis of the relative pros and cons of the options before us. We're confident that California WaterFix must be a fundamental component for any water security plan in the City of Los Angeles, and we hope that you'll reach the same conclusion.

Thanks so much for your consideration,



Jessica Lall
President & CEO, Central City Association of Los Angeles

Cc: Councilmember Paul Koretz, Vice Chair
Councilmember Paul Krekorian

Councilmember Gil Cedillo
Councilmember Mitch O'Farrell