

**Greater Los Angeles Integrated Regional Water Management Plan  
Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles River Watershed  
March 20, 2007, 12:30 pm to 2 pm  
Lakewood City Hall, Council Chambers**

**Present:**

John Biggs, Brown and Caldwell  
Shirley Birosik, LA RWQCB  
Deborah Chankin, GCCOG  
Michael Drennan, Brown and Caldwell  
Belinda Faustinos, RMC  
Michael Gagan, ROK

James Glancy, Lakewood  
Terri Grant, LA Co. DPW  
David Hill, CBMWD  
Frank Kuo, LA Co. DPR/FCD  
Joone Lopez, CBMWD  
Sarina Morales-Choate, SFS

Kara Medrano, CBMWD  
Scott Rigg, COW  
Kevin Wattier, LBWD  
Ralph Webb, SCWC JPA  
Robb Whitaker, WRD  
Mary Zauner, LACSD

Topic/Issue	Discussion	Action/Follow up
<b>1. Introductions</b>	Belinda Faustinos asked Michael Drennan to facilitate the meeting as the main agenda item is a discussion of the draft project prioritization framework. Michael Drennan opened the meeting and welcomed everyone at 12:35 PM	
<b>1b. Review of DWR Meeting Notes</b>	<p>Michael Drennan reviewed meeting notes from Mario Acevedo taken during the DWR funding meeting with Los Angeles and Ventura County with Steering Committee</p> <p>Notes from Mario are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are three IRWMP efforts within the two Counties <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Greater Los Angeles County IRWMP (adopted December 13, 2006)</li> <li>▪ Ventura Countywide IRWMP (adopted)</li> <li>▪ Upper Santa Clarita (IRWMP underway)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Representatives from each of the three areas provided a brief update on the background, status, and next steps of their IRWMP efforts</li> <li>• It is very clear that all three regions want to keep their autonomy and not pursue the development of a super umbrella IRWMP</li> <li>• Representatives from the three regions are meeting to discuss how to equitably split the \$215 million of earmarked Proposition 84 IRWMP funds between the Counties (primary participants include Dee Zinke [Calleguas], Sue Hughes [Ventura County], Michael Hurley [Castaic Lake Water Agency], Mark Pestrella, Sharon Green, and Tom Erb)</li> <li>• The split of the \$900,000 statewide Prop 84 IRWMP dollars was based on a baseline funding level of \$25 per region with the remainder being allocated based on population</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• County will continue meeting with Ventura County and DWR to reach consensus on Prop 84 Funding</li> </ul>

*The Mission of the Greater Los Angeles IRWMP is to address the water resources needs of the Region in an integrated and collaborative manner.*

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In terms of population, LA County has about 10,000,000 residents, Ventura County has about 900,000 residents and Upper Santa Clarita has about 200,000 residents</li> <li>• Ventura County will not support a split based solely on population; the three areas are discussing other factors such as water supply and water quality needs that can be used in developing a funding allocation formula; the Leadership Committee is developing a matrix of water supply objectives and quantifiable targets (per the LA IRWMP) that will be shared with Ventura County and the Upper Santa Clarita Watershed for this purpose</li> <li>• All three regions prefer that DWR take a performance based approach rather than a competitive approach in upcoming grant funding administration; the three regions acknowledged that a cycle of competition is inherent as each region prioritizes its respective projects</li> <li>• DWR indicated that out of the Proposition 84 funds, 8.5 percent gets taken off the top (5 percent for DWR to administration the bond programs and 3.5 percent for bond issues fees and administration)</li> <li>• DWR anticipates allocating the Prop 84 funds over four years with funding cycles in years 1, 2, and 4</li> <li>• For the first funding cycle year, DWR only expects to have 145 million of statewide funding available; the majority of the funding will occur in years 2 and 4</li> <li>• It is expected that DWR will have an expedited round 2 of Proposition 50 IRWMP funding this calendar year; there is speculation that grant recipients in the first funding cycle will not be eligible to compete for these funds</li> <li>• DWR hopes to have draft guidelines in May or June and final guidelines later this year; DWR desires that guidelines be applicable statewide and not by region</li> <li>• DWR is encouraging regions to start prioritizing their projects now rather than waiting for the guidelines; regions will have to explain what criteria they used for prioritizing projects</li> <li>• State is expected to provide feedback on adopted IRWMPs; State hopes to have more spend more time with each of the regions as the IRWMPs evolve and are implemented</li> </ul> <p>Additional Steering Committee comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Last Friday (3/16/07) at CalFed meeting the status of Prop 50 funds was still up in the air</li> <li>• Budget and Policy Committees interested in how Prop 84 money is paid out.</li> <li>• Legislature may get involved in the pay outs associated with Prop 84 funding</li> <li>• Policy Committees may want to better define the process for IRWMPs, but may not carry over to the Budget Committees.</li> <li>• State isn't combining Prop 50 and Prop 84</li> <li>• Funding allocated to Region under Prop 84 will not be reassigned to other regions</li> </ul>	
<p><b>2. Project Prioritization Framework</b></p>	<p>Michael Drennan gave a presentation and led a discussion regarding the development of a project prioritization structure for the IRWMP, and indicated the consultant team will be making a recommendation regarding a project prioritization framework based on input from the Steering Committees.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prioritization Key Issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The framework should identify the best set of projects for multiple funding sources, and should not simply focus on the next grant opportunity.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Email is needed to project submitters to update latitude and longitude to at least 4 decimal places, location description, property ownership,</li> </ul>

*The Mission of the Greater Los Angeles IRWMP is to address the water resources needs of the Region in an integrated and collaborative manner.*

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The framework should include a ranking factor to address critical needs of local area (For example, some older cities have aging infrastructure that if repaired would lead to conservation of water supply, or improvement of water quality)</li> <li>▪ The framework should acknowledge the needs to assist disadvantaged communities</li> <li>▪ Disadvantaged communities will need planning funds to identify critical needs</li> <li>▪ Perform gap analysis to determine: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Where are projects needed</li> <li>▪ Outreach to the gap areas</li> <li>▪ Need planning funds to help close the gap</li> <li>▪ What organizations can help to plan and implement projects</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Subregional targets and quantified benefits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Some commenters suggested that subregional quantified targets are needed to help determine what projects are appropriate for the subregion. Other commenters didn't think subregional targets were needed at this stage.</li> <li>▪ IRWMP assesses how far we have come and where we are short</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ The framework should allow for a balance of the most appropriate set of projects, and not just rank projects individually against each other. The ultimate goal is to develop the best program for the subregion, not simply the best projects.</li> <li>▪ Framework should consider the need to consider health and safety</li> <li>▪ There are a lot of single purpose projects on the list. Need to put together a list of targets for this round and assemble projects to meet targets through a balanced program.</li> <li>▪ There is ultimately a need for a subregional plan to fill gaps in the future</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create list of projects then target projects that are the best fit for a funding source.</li> <li>• State is asking the Region to determine what the Region really needs, rather than relying on the State to make that determination.</li> <li>• State has endorsed the concept of the LA IRWMP quantified targets.</li> <li>• Framework should acknowledge the importance of small projects, and should encourage small projects to be combined with larger projects.</li> <li>• Add "balanced program" as ranking criteria.</li> <li>• Consider regional ideas that don't have a location, but integrate to any project</li> <li>• Other criteria that should be included in framework: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Funding requirements</li> <li>▪ Practicality of project</li> <li>▪ Project readiness</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Larger regional agencies may be able to offer assistance to manage projects to help get smaller stakeholders involved. Consider an administration fee to be charged to reduce reluctance to manage.</li> <li>• Subregions should be in control of their own destiny, and offer recommendations for projects for the Region.</li> <li>• The Leadership Committee should continue to provide input on consistency of projects regionally, and offer input on the best set of projects for the Region.</li> </ul>	<p>benefits and project readiness, and request that project information be updated prior to May 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Belinda wanted copy of project database</li> <li>• Technical Memo will be released before the end of April outlining the draft prioritization framework</li> </ul>
--	--	--

*The Mission of the Greater Los Angeles IRWMP is to address the water resources needs of the Region in an integrated and collaborative manner.*

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider defining a separate category for small projects that may not fit in other categories.</li> <li>• Need to encourage project proponents to fill in information gaps in existing IRWMP database to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Range of Costs</li> <li>▪ Location</li> <li>▪ Ownership of property</li> <li>▪ Etc</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Use database as gathering point of all project info <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Finalize format of database</li> <li>▪ Consultant will start evaluating projects on May 1</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Waiting until the end to integrate projects may miss some good projects.</li> <li>• The Steering Committee should consider the prioritization framework as a tool, but ultimately there needs to be a discussion at the Steering Committee regarding the selection of the projects.</li> <li>• There should be qualitative and quantitative components to the prioritization framework.</li> <li>• Intra-subregional projects need should be addressed.</li> <li>• Don't like the idea of assigning weights to targets.</li> <li>• Don't want to overlook projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Analysis of how well project meets overall goals</li> <li>▪ Look at projects without quantified benefits listed</li> <li>▪ Rank projects first then look at GIS</li> <li>▪ Should consider a special meeting with Steering committee to go through list of existing projects.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The first cut of projects should be made in mid-May. There should there be another meeting to discuss what projects made or didn't make the first cut.</li> <li>• The Subregional Steering Committee would like to test the framework based on the first cut of projects, and then revisit it to assure it delivers the appropriate results</li> <li>• The framework needs flexibility</li> <li>• The framework should encourage subregional autonomy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Different framework for each subregion</li> <li>▪ Same framework for each subregion with different weights</li> <li>▪ Maintain consistency to keep regional feel</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Framework should highlight important issues to subregion, but still meet regional goals</li> <li>• Framework should encourage balanced programs</li> </ul>	
<b>3. Upcoming Meetings/ Workshops</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Next Steering Committee meeting on April 3, 2007 at 12:30 PM to 2 PM, at Lakewood City Hall Executive Board Room, Lakewood, CA</li> <li>• Next Leadership Committee meeting on April 5, 2007 at 9:30, at LA County DPW, Alhambra, CA.</li> </ul>	

*The Mission of the Greater Los Angeles IRWMP is to address the water resources needs of the Region in an integrated and collaborative manner.*

SIGN IN SHEET

IRWMP SG+LA Lower River Watershed

March 20, 2007

Name	Agency	Email	Phone #
Jocine Lopez	Central Basin MWD	jloznel@centralbasin.org	(310) 436-2604
Karla Medrano	Central Basin MWD	KMedrano@centralbasin.org	438-2412
Renee VFuentes	Renee	bfuentes@mc.ex.gov	438-4318
Joe P. Ricc	COV	friggoci.vernon.ca.us	(522) 573-2811
KEVIN WATTIER	LBWD	Kevin_wattier@lbwtr.org	562/434-6116
Shirley Birnsik			
TERRE GRANT	LACo DPW	tgrant@dpo.lacounty.gov	626 458 4309
Mary Zauner	LALSO	mzauner@lalsd.org	562 699 7411 x2820
FRANK Kuo	LAA/AN/FA	Fkuo@LAA.AN.FA.org	562 798 7194
ROBB WHITAKER	WRP	rwhitaker@wrp.org	562
Deborah Chauhan	GLCOG	deborahc@glcolink.net	663-6851
James Glancy	LAKESIDE	JamesG@lakeside.org	562 766 9771
ARBIT WEBB	SWC DPT	ARBIT@swc.dpt.ca.gov	714-840-5338
Sarina Morales-Choate	SFS	sarmora@schwaite.com	562 899 5358
Michael Aguon	Rak	aguon@hoketindel.com	213 624 1046
David Hill	Central Basin	daveh@centralbasin.org	
John B. S. S.	BC	jbigs@bmcald.com	213 893 2700

The Mission of the Greater Los Angeles IRWMP is to address the water resources needs of the Region in an integrated and collaborative manner.