

**Greater Los Angeles Integrated Regional Water Management Plan
North Santa Monica Bay Steering Committee
City of Calabasas
City Council Chambers
26135 Mureau Road
Calabasas, CA 91302**

**Wednesday March 12, 2008
9:00 am – 11:30 am**

Meeting Notes

Present:

Barbara Cameron
Randal Orton
Frank Kuo

Tom West
Dawn Hock
Michael Hart

Kevin Coyne
Melina Watts
Leighanne Reeser (phone)

Oliver Galang (phone)
Shirley Birosik (phone)

Agenda Item	Topic/ Issue	Discussion	Action Item/Follow Up
1	Welcome, Introductions	Barbara led meeting introductions.	
2	Review/approve February 19 Meeting Notes	Barbara stated that she had completed her task under Agenda Item 5 before the meeting notes were written. Formal approval of the meeting notes was held over until the next meeting.	SC members to forward any further comments to Tom West.
3	Discuss February 27 Leadership Committee outcomes	<p>Below is a summary of topics discussed at the February 27 Leadership Committee and discussion from the Steering Committee</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Gateway Cities have formed a JPA and will apply to be their own IRWM group. DWR has said that it won't distribute funds until this issue is addressed. 2. There was a lengthy discussion about re-opening discussions with the Gateway Cities JPA group. LA County is drafting a letter to the group. 3. The Ventura Watershed Coalition has responded to Los Angeles County's letter regarding how Prop 84 funds should be distributed. The LC feels they should reopen a dialogue with the Ventura IRWM and Upper Santa Clara groups by drafting a letter to them. <p>The SC agrees that at the next LC meeting it should be stated that the NSMB SC supports a dialogue between the Los Angeles IRWM group, the Ventura IRWM group, and the Santa Clara River group. In addition, the SC members</p>	

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

		<p>requested that all sub-regions be notified of future meetings with the Ventura IRWM group and be allowed to participate.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. The legislative subcommittee will have a conference call March 13 to discuss legislative issues, particularly how to go to Los Angeles County officials and gain their support for how Prop. 84 funds should be split between Ventura and LA regions. It was noted that representatives Kuehl and Brownlee share both Ventura and LA interests and that Kuehl's chief of staff said she is willing to host a meeting of the two parties to discuss. Barbara will attend via phone. 5. AB 1420 was brought to the group's attention. This bill states that if any water agency doesn't meet water use efficiency standards as evaluated by POWER, they will not be awarded grant funds. This includes IRWMs. 	
4	IRWM Plan Update	<p>Tom West discussed the 2008 update of the IRWM plan. The purpose of the initial update is to bring it up to Prop 84 standards and be able to apply for planning and implementation grant funds. After planning grant funds have been obtained, a more thorough update of the plan can be done to address larger/broader changes that are needed. Tom stated that there will be no major changes made to the overall look of the plan, but it will be an opportunity for regions to provide input. The initial update will take place over approximately the next five months.</p> <p>Oliver stated that the county should compare the IRWMP document with the County's RWIP to help update the IRWMP.</p> <p>Randal has met with his District's General Manager and found that many changes have been made to the LVMWD strategic plan that may need to be considered for the IRWM plan update.</p> <p>Randal commented that the LC has not yet talked about ultimate sub-regional chapter control, and feels that editorial control should exist within the SC.</p> <p>Tom expects to have an outline of changes to be made to each IRWMP section by the next SC meeting. The consultant group will work with the SC to make the updates.</p> <p>The group agreed that the IRWMP update should occur in two phases:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Light update: where glaring issues are addressed to bring the plan up to Prop 84 standards and apply for grant funds. 	<p>Oliver will send a link to the RWIP to Tom, and Tom will forward the link to the SC.</p> <p>Oliver will compare the IRWMP to the RWIP and provide comments to Tom.</p>

		2. Full update: where more detailed changes are made using planning grant money.	
5	Sub-regional Workshop dates and topics	<p>It was discussed that the sub-regional workshop should be utilized to talk about projects, obtain feedback, network, and find opportunities for integration and collaboration among project proponents. The group agreed that the projects discussed in the workshop should only be those that qualify for Prop 84 funds. It was noted that this workshop will be a good opportunity to encourage greater steering committee participation as well as update the project database.</p> <p>It was stated that “unfathered” projects should be archived.</p> <p>Randal felt this may be a good opportunity for a second meeting of the project subcommittee.</p> <p>A letter will be drafted to SC members stating that projects will be chosen at the workshop for the implementation grant; this letter should include a project prioritization list.</p> <p>Letters will be emailed to project proponents to encourage them to update their projects in the database and bring the sub-regional workshop to their attention.</p> <p>The group agreed that the workshop should include a tutorial on how to enter projects into the project database. The workshop should also include a CIP overview.</p> <p>The group agreed that this workshop should take place by the end of May.</p>	<p>Tom will draft a workshop agenda within the next week.</p> <p>Tom will draft a letter to the SC regarding the sub-regional workshop.</p> <p>Tom will draft a letter to project proponents regarding updating projects in the database and the sub-regional workshop.</p>
6a	Other consultant activities	<p>Tom West discussed other consultant activities, as listed below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Planning needs: As the IRWMP is updated, it is recommended that the SC focus on the section entitled “Next Steps” (Section 7.10) within the current IRWMP. The SC should identify what is most important to the NSMB for the light update and try to capture the implementation phases discussed in the “Next Steps” and the issues discussed in the “Additional Planning” subsection. The group should also consider projects that have been implemented since the current IRWMP was completed or will be completed this year. Comments and feedback will be revisited at the next meeting. 2. DAC Outreach: There are no DACs in the NSMB region, however, the region’s amenities are an advantage to DACs in other regions. The way this will be addressed will be discussed at the next meeting. In the mean time, an outline of the region’s DAC outreach strategy plan is 	<p>Tom will create a blank “Next Steps” table and distribute it to SC members. SC members are asked to provide their comments on the table and send back to Tom prior to the April steering committee meeting.</p> <p>Tom will distribute the outline of the DAC Outreach strategic plan to the SC for review and comment.</p>

		<p>being developed and will be circulated to the SC for review and input.</p> <p>3. Sub-regional CIP strategy development:: The purpose of this activity is to provide a basis to bridge the gap of moving from a large database of projects to creating a subset of projects that can be included in a CIP. A TM will be created to explain CIPs including their role, approach, implications, and management. This TM will be used as a tool to enable non-CIP driven agencies to get a better understanding of the grant process. Tom distributed an outline of the TM for review and comment. This will be on the agenda for the sub-regional workshop proposed for May.</p>	
6b	MOU and Operating Guidelines	<p>Below are comments provided by the SC on the MOU and Operating Guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Signatories on the Operating Guidelines must match those on the MOU. o The Recitals section of the MOU speaks too much to state funding alone and should reference other funding sources. o Section 2.1.2 of the MOU should include internal funding contributions. o Section 2.4 of the MOU should include more specific language on how a party endorses the MOU. o Section 3.6 of the MOU should not limit the number of LC members. This should be included in the Operating Guidelines. o The Background section of the Operating Guidelines should refer to habitat and recreational access – it currently only mentions water. o Section II.a.5. of the Guidelines conflicts with the MOU. o Line 138 of the Guidelines should state “The affirmative vote of the majority of a quorum of the Steering Committee members is required for all decisions and recommendations of the Steering Committee.” o Line 179 should include that the Vice Chair can call meetings as well as the Chair. o Section III.a. of the Guidelines should include language stating that the Chair will be elected by the majority members of the LC and that it is not always the Flood Control District. o Language regarding equal funding distribution should not be included in the Guidelines. 	
7	Funding and Contribution Status	No new news.	
8	Outreach to Cities and Other Parties	Kevin took the Ventura/Malibu issues to the Ventura IRWMP group and was able to get the issues on the agenda for the next meeting.	Kevin to contact Joe Bellomo regarding the letter he is drafting to the Ventura County Watershed Protection Division inviting to participate in the NSMB

			group.
9	Steering Committee Participation	The group discussed the low participation levels of the SC, and noted that they may be due to the current meeting time. An inventory of possible meeting dates will be put forward to the SC.	Tom will send an email requesting feedback on other possible meeting dates.
10	Other Items	<p>Melina discussed the Runoff Conference that she recently organized.</p> <p>Kevin stated that the Coastal Commission will be doing an LID conference in the near future.</p> <p>Randal stated that the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District has been researching the energy-water nexus, and has obtained nearly all energy costs incurred for the pumping and treatment of potable and recycled water in the district. The only missing piece is cost of pumping by customers. Energy ties into the IRWMP in that energy savings lead to GHG reductions, a plan requirement. Energy saved by reduction in water use also leads to cost savings.</p>	<p>Kevin will forward Tom information regarding the Coastal Commission's LID Conference. Tom will forward the information to the SC group.</p> <p>Tom will forward information to the group on the CPUC water-energy savings program.</p>
11	Future Agenda Items	It was requested that we add funding opportunities to the agenda for both the next steering committee meeting and the sub-regional workshop.	
12	Next Meetings	<p>Leadership Committee Meeting March 26: 9:30 - noon LACDPW in Alhambra</p> <p>NSMB Steering Committee April 15, 9 am to 11:30 am LVMWD, Conference Room B</p>	