To: Enrique Zaldivar[enrique.zaldivar@lacity.org]; Wang, Guangyu@Waterboards[Guangyu.Wang@waterboards.ca.gov]; Yelensky, Erica[Yelensky.Erica@epa.gov]; Bruce Reznik[bruce@lawaterkeeper.org]; Sarah Sikich[ssikich@healthebay.org]; Gloria Gray[ggrayi@aol.com]; Lippman, Timothy[tlippman@bos.lacounty.gov]; Fran Diamond[mediafranh2o@gmail.com]
From: Walter Lamb
Sent: Fri 10/20/2017 6:38:44 PM
Subject: Thank you and follow up notes

Good morning,
I'm copying a smaller group (EC members, Guangyu and Erica) with the hopes that you can most effectively and constructively use the information below. To start, yesterday's open discussion regarding SMBRC and the draft restoration plans for the Ballona Wetlands was very much appreciated. Although this ecosystem is too often associated with years of inter-personal conflict, it is really a magical place for kids and adults alike to observe and appreciate nature. Whatever we can do to get the ultimate restoration project right is well worth the effort. Please take the comments below in that spirit:

- It was confusing to hear that SMBRC has only one staff member. There are five staff members listed on the web site (http://www.smbrc.ca.gov/about_us/staff.shtml) four of whom are also listed in the current work plan, Additionally, several other SMBNEP staff work in the SMBRC's state office space. In the course of discussing how the SMBNEP is structured, it may be helpful to develop a more clear definition of SMBRC staff. Our interest in that topic relates to SMBRC's ability to at least partially comment on the Draft EIR.

- Along those lines, SMBRC has considerable control over its staffing as the Management Committee of the national estuary program, in which role it creates and approves the work plan that sets staffing levels within available budgets (including the US EPA Section 320 funds). If the Governing Board believes current staffing levels are insufficient to accomplish the public tasks of the SMBRC, it may be helpful to the Governing Board members to understand their role in setting those staffing levels via the Work Plan.

- Some Governing Board members appear interested in a better understanding of how the agenda is set. There had been discussion of adding a Ballona Wetlands agenda item at the July Executive Committee meeting. Approval of such an item at the September Executive Committee meeting would have allowed an action that many members seemed interested in taking. Do the Governing Board members receive the notices for the Executive Committee meetings with an explanation that they can make requests for agenda items up until 10 days prior to their meetings? If not, that may be worth a discussion.

- With regards to the Santa Monica Bay Restoration Authority, it is not clear why funding and contracts for some SMBNEP projects are routed through the SMBRA whereas other, seemingly similar projects are executed directly between the private Bay Foundation and the funding entity. This is relevant to stakeholders of the Ballona Wetlands because funding for that project had once been contemplated to go through the SMBRA (the grant was executed with the Coastal Conservancy but rescinded before any transfer of funds). In the context of the larger SMBNEP structure, it may be helpful for SMBRA and SMBRC (and the public) to understand the decision making process for determining when Foundation projects are managed with the SMBRA's

public resources (County and State).

Again, these comments are offered only with the hope that they may generate some discussion during the ongoing revision process for the Bay Restoration Plan, which includes an evaluation of the SMBNEP's organizational structure. Thank you again for your work yesterday and moving forward.

Walter

Walter Lamb
Ballona Wetlands Land Trust
310-384-1042
Facebook