

Greater Los Angeles Integrated Regional Water Management Plan
IRWMP Leadership Committee
June 7, 2007, 8:00 am to 12 pm
Los Angeles County Flood Control District
12th Floor Executive Conference Room

Present:

Mario Acevedo, LA DWP
 John Biggs, Brown and Caldwell
 Hector Bordas, LA Co FCD
 Grace Burgess, San Gabriel WQA
 Diego Cadena, LA Co FCD
 Barbara Cameron, City of Malibu
 Grace Chan, MWD
 Michael Drennan, BC
 Tom Erb, LA DWP
 Belinda Faustinos, RMC
 Al Gribnau, LA Co FCD

Sharon Green, LACSD
 Mark Horne, EIP Associates
 Shahram Kharaghani
 Chris Kroll, Coastal Conservancy (via phone)
 Frank Kuo, LA Co FCD
 Shelley Luce, SM Bay Restoration Commission
 Vivian Marquez, LA BOS
 Ed Means, Malcolm Pirnie
 Rich Nagel, West Basin MWD

Melih Ozbilgin, Brown and Caldwell
 Rochelle Paras, LACDPW
 Mark Pestrella, LACDPW
 Leighanne Reeser, West Basin MWD
 Randy Schollerman, Upper SGMWD
 Nancy Steele, LASG Watershed
 Tom West, RMC Water Environment
 Carol Williams, Main San Gabriel Basin Watermaster
 Tony Zampielo, Upper SGMWD
 Mary Zauner, LACSD

Topic/Issue	Discussion	Action/Follow up
1. Introductions a. Call to Order b. Roll Call of Members Present	Diego Cadena called the meeting to order at 8:10 AM with introductions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action
2. Review Meeting Summary from May 7, 2007 a. Approve Summary	<p>The minutes from the May meeting were distributed.</p> <p>Amendments were requested to verify the attendance list on the minutes as well as add the formation of the Scope of Work Subcommittee with the names of the members to the Action items of the meeting minutes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes approved with Amendments
3. Public Comment Period a. The Public is Provided an Opportunity to Address the Committee	Public comment was received regarding ensuring the project reaches the public, particularly the disadvantaged communities. The public needs to be better informed about how the process works. The Leadership Committee (LC) was encouraged to increase public access and involvement in the process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action
4. Report form Subregional Steering Committees a. Decision-Making	<p>Decision-Making Structure</p> <p>Ed Means led a facilitated discussion on the revised Decision-Making Structure TM with additional Steering Committee input incorporated and a review of the recommended roles and responsibilities.</p>	<p>The following Motions were passed for review by Steering Committees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motion: Retain existing appointment process for the selection of SC representatives to the LC, with the

<p>Structure b. Mechanism to Formalize Structure (MOU)</p>	<p>LC Expansion to 16 Members. Based on input from the Chairs of all Steering Committees (SC), the LC was supportive of the expansion to 16 members with limited discussion. In preparation for the pending expansion of the LC, the group discussed beginning the process of Subregions selecting their additional representative, selecting alternates and developing a list of nominees to serve in the role of the five watershed management areas (WMA). Discussion occurred on when the expansion should take place. The general feeling was it would occur in the period of time between July and September. As a result the LC passed a motion tasking the SC with selection of their second representative for the next LC meeting, developing a list of WMA representative nominees, and determine alternate if possible by July Meeting.</p> <p>Selection of WMA representatives. The discussion regarding WMA representatives centered on alternative methods from the LC recommendations provided at the May LC meeting and reviewed by at various SC meetings. The discussion centered on the involvement and roles of the SC and LC in the selection of the WMA representatives. Dual motions were passed regarding the selection of WMA representatives which stated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Retain existing appointment process for the selection of WMA representatives to the LC, from nominations from the SC, with no single agency having more than one seat. (Motion carried Yes – 7, No – 3) ◆ Each SC should consider nomination of a candidate for each of the five WMA’s without geographic consideration, from which the LC would make selections without regard to the geographic location of the representatives, with one representative for each WMA selected from each SC’s list of nominees. (Motion carried unanimously) <p>Opinions were expressed that not every SC had the opportunity to discuss the pros and cons of these options at the subregional level and felt it was unfair to the subregion to move ahead at this point. Others stated that at some point the LC needs to make a decision on the LC composition so that the process can continue moving forward. Included in the discussion was the desire that the WMA representatives represent a regional view and expertise and not merely the advocate of the subregion that selected/nominated them, as well as the value in giving the WMA representatives a vote on the LC. It was highlighted that the LC should</p>	<p>addition of WMA representatives to the LC, from nominations from the SC (see motion below), with no single agency having more than one seat. (Motion carried Yes – 7, No – 3) – This motion included unanimous support for expanding to a 16 member LC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Motion: Each SC should consider nominating one candidate for each of the five WMA’s without geographic consideration, from which the LC would make selections without regard to the geographic location of the representatives, with one representative selected from each SC’s list of nominees for each of the five WMA’s. (Motion carried unanimously) ● Motion: Existing WMA representatives were directed to write up WMA qualifications for LC review. (Motion carried unanimously) ● Motion: Alternates for subregional representatives may attend LC meetings with proxy voting rights. (Motion carried unanimously) ● Motion: The selection of alternates shall be at the discretion of the SC. (Motion carried unanimously) ● Motion: Add to the list of SC roles and responsibilities, “Provide a forum for airing and resolution of project proponents concerns.” (Motion carried Yes – 8, No – 2) ● Motion: Rename the LC to Regional Coordinating Committee (RCC) or Regional Coordinating Council (RCC). Issue was tabled to a later meeting
---	---	---

	<p>take the larger regional view to ensure that the Region is moving forward to meet the Regional targets and addressing the goals laid out in the IRWMP, in which the WMA reps would provide valuable input to that process.</p> <p>A resolution was agreed upon in principal to table the issue of defining the process to select the WMA representatives to the July LC meeting, allowing for time for the SC's to discuss the motions passed by the LC committee and develop a consensus on the passed motions or provide an alternate approach.</p> <p>WMA Qualifications. The general feeling of the LC was that there should be some minimum qualifications for WMA representatives. Discussion covered the County, Consultant, and existing WMA representatives developing qualifications. The LC passed a motion stating existing WMA representatives should be assigned the task to write up WMA qualifications for LC review.</p> <p>Alternates for Subregional Representatives. The discussion was supportive of the idea of having alternates to represent a subregion in the event that the primary representative cannot make a meeting. A motion passed supporting the attendance of alternates at LC meetings and to allow them to vote by proxy. The discussion also focused on the selection of the alternates and reached a unanimous motion that the selection of the alternate be left up to the discretion of the SC.</p> <p>LC Terms. The LC supported in principal the staggering of LC terms to avoid complete roll over of the LC at the ending of the term time frame. Term length was previously discussed at the May meeting; three years appears generally acceptable but should be confirmed at the July meeting.</p> <p>SC Roles and Responsibilities. Discussion occurred on the role of the SC to be the primary contact for project proponents and the forum to address project proponent concerns. It was felt that the LC is not the appropriate forum to address local issues and the local subregion should be responsible for dealing with those issues. It was also stated that the SC could then raise the issues to the attention of the LC as well as the opportunity for project proponent to raise the issue to the LC through the Public Comment portion of the regular meeting agenda. As a result a motion was passed amending the roles and responsibilities of the SC to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motion: Each SC should select their second representative for the LC meeting, develop list of WMA representative nominees, and determine alternate if possible by July Meeting. (Motion carried unanimously) - • Tabled Issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ When to seat the new 16 member LC ○ Length of terms ○ Project Proponents not voting on their own projects for prioritization ○ Staggering of terms • County will continue working on scope of work for new MOU with consultant.
--	--	--

	<p>include: "Provide a forum for airing and resolution of project proponents concerns."</p> <p>Project Prioritization/Selection. The issue of the involvement of project proponents who also serve on the LC or SC in the selection of projects was raised, however discussing and resolving the issue was unanimously tabled to a later meeting.</p> <p>Naming of the Leadership Committee. Possible alternate names for the LC were presented to the LC which included Regional Coordinating Committee/Council (RCC), Coordinating Council/Committee (CC), or Leadership Committee (LC). The issue was tabled to a later meeting and will be discussed at the SC level for further input.</p> <p>Mechanism to Formalize Structure (MOU) Acknowledged the need to start working on a new MOU. Stressed the importance of Steering and Leadership Committee involvement. Currently working with consultant on scope of work for development of new MOU.</p>	
<p>5. Report on Consultant Contract Status/Issues</p> <p>a. Status of Deliverables and Schedule</p> <p>i. Technical Memo on Decision-Making Structure</p> <p>ii. Project Prioritization Framework</p> <p>iii. Project Integration Exercise</p> <p>b. Report from Future Scope of Work Subcommittee</p>	<p>Status of Deliverables and Schedule Melih Ozbilgin gave an update on the status of the project deliverables and schedule.</p> <p>Task 1 – Will be completed after finalization of Decision-Making Structure TM (including some addition Steering Committee support).</p> <p>Task 2 – Final Prioritization TM will be completed next week.</p> <p>Task 3 – In various stages of completion varying based on conditions and requests by each Subregion/Steering Committee.</p> <p>Task 4 - Highlight Document currently on hold.</p> <p>Task 5 - Additional meeting support has been completed</p> <p>.</p> <p>Report from Future Scope of Work Subcommittee The Future Scope of Work Subcommittee gave an update on their recent meeting regarding short and long term scopes of work.</p> <p>Short Term – Discussed using remaining funds of approximately \$110,000 to extend Brown and Caldwell’s existing contract from July 1 to October 31, 2007 to provide:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Future Scope of Work Subcommittee will continue to meet and develop the future scope.

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Additional Meeting Support for Leadership and Steering Committee 2. Support for development of new MOU <p>It was acknowledged that the SC's will need additional technical support from a consultant regarding ongoing project development and integration, and project prioritization for upcoming grant opportunities. The remaining funds are likely not sufficient to support these tasks. It was suggested there be support provided for continuing prioritization and project development under conditions of a not-to-exceed budget. It was acknowledged that the Region needs to move towards developing longer term support for their process either through dedicated agency staff, or future consultant support including a new scope of work, budget, and selection process. The possibility of alternate deliverables was raised due to varying needs of each Steering Committee.</p> <p>Long Term – Discussed during closed session (consultant not present).</p>	
<p>6. IRWM Program News</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Draft Letter to Dr. Snow Regarding Prop 84 b. Meeting of Los Angeles/Ventura and Upper Santa Clara River c. Contract with DWR Regarding \$25M Prop 50, Round 1 Grant d. \$25M Grant - Proposed Press Conference 	<p>Draft Letter to Dr. Snow Regarding Prop 84 A draft letter was distributed and reviewed regarding Prop 84 funding and the incorporation of comments from the LC. The merits of informing Ventura was discussed and if the letter would have any impact on the current meeting occurring between Los Angeles and Ventura. In addition it was raised that the letter was not clear on the issue of the base funding amount and the number of regions DWR should consider in the funding areas. The opinion was expressed that the letter may be premature and other measures, including advocating through Legislators, should be investigated to advocate the Region's perspective as well as to affirm to Ventura the desire to work together.</p> <p>Meeting of Los Angeles/Ventura and Upper Santa Clara River Recent meeting was cancelled and is in the process of being rescheduled.</p> <p>Contract with DWR Regarding \$25M Prop 50, Round 1 Grant The County is continuing to work on finishing the contract language with DWR.</p> <p>\$25M Prop 50, Round 1 Grant - Proposed Press Conference There is a press conference planned to announce the aware of \$25M Grant to the Region. It is scheduled to take place on July 19th in Carson or Whittier Narrows and is being arranged by the Sanitation District of Los Angeles County. Reviewed the importance of the Press Conference to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Legislative Subcommittee will convene and investigate Legislative options. • The County will hold off on sending the letter DWR at this point • The meetings between Los Angeles, Ventura and Upper Santa Clara River will continue. • The County and Sanitation District will finalize the details on the location of the Press conference and inform the Leadership and Steering Committees on the details of the Press Conference.

	involve the public and get the message out about the success of the process and how it is moving forward	
7. Future Agenda Items/Other Items a. Revise Date of July Meeting	Discussed moving the Meeting to occur on July 19 th at the location of the press conference, and immediately following the press conference. The general feeling of the Committee was that there were no problems with the location and date change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The County will update the Leadership Committee and Steering Committee members on the revised date, time and location for the July Leadership Committee Meeting.
8. Meeting Adjournment	Meeting Adjourned by Diego Cadena at 12:01 pm.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action
9. Next Meeting	Next Leadership Committee meeting on July 19, 2007 Time and Location to be determined.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action