From: Wilson, Erinn@Wildlife
To: Chirdon, Matthew@Wildlife
Subject: RE: LADPW Due Diligence Review
Date: Monday, October 24, 2016 3:06:08 PM

Matt
You should contact Sean McWhirter for financial and Beatriz Rambarran for the other questions. I would love to help. but don't have those answers.

Erinn Wilson
Senior Environmental Scientist (Supervisory)
4665 Lampson Ave.
Los Alamitos CA 90720
(562) 342-7172

Every Californian should conserve water. Find out how at:

SaveOurWater.com · Drought.CA.gov

-----Original Message-----
From: Chirdon, Matthew@Wildlife
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2016 2:10 PM
To: Wilson, Erinn@Wildlife
Subject: FW: LADPW Due Diligence Review

Do you have time to talk about my questions on the Due Diligence review before our Wed. meeting on Devil's Gate? They always have it on the agenda.

MC
P: 805.640.1165

Every Californian should conserve water. Find out how at:

SaveOurWater.com · Drought.CA.gov

-----Original Message-----
From: Chirdon, Matthew@Wildlife
Sent: Monday, October 17, 2016 5:23 PM
To: 'Wilson, Erinn@Wildlife (Erinn.Wilson@wildlife.ca.gov)'
Subject: LADPW Due Diligence Review

I have completed the Due Diligence review. Most questions the LACFCD answered adequately (outside of the financials that HQ will review). I did have some questions though that I wanted to discuss.

Question F 16. Talks about whether LACFCD has been subject to IRS, AG, CA BOE, CA Employment Devp. Dept., CA Franchise Tax board investigations. LACFCD marked no but the question is written as if CDFW needs to perform a check either way they answer. Is this something I should call on?

Question I. 25 discusses a Conflict of Interest Policy. I don't find anything in the Charter discussing a Conflict of Interest Policy for Board of Supervisors. The only thing I found was in Misc. Section 54 discussing no financial interest for appointed officers.

Question I.33 Long-term Funding. LACFCD discusses carrying over funds when excess available fund balances are available. LACFCD has not provided a strategy to "actively accumulate funds" to deal long-term costs. This is consistent with what we have observed for long-term funding discussions for Devil's Gate on site mitigation. I think we should be looking at how other public agencies that have been approved answered this question. I don't see it as an acceptable answer for any area that is conglomerating wetland and stream habitat for losses elsewhere.