

IRWMP Leadership Committee

Greater Los Angeles Integrated Regional Water Management Plan
 February 27, 9:30 am to 12 pm
 Los Angeles County Flood Control District
 12th Floor Executive Conference Room

Present:

John Biggs, Brown and Caldwell
 Hector Bordas, LACFCD
 Grace Chan, MWDCS
 Donna Chen, City of Los Angeles
 Scott Dellinger, Brown and Caldwell
 Joyce Dillard
 Tome Erb, LADWP
 Deborah Glaser, LASGRWC
 Teri Grant, LACFCD
 Sharon Green, LACSD

Shahram Kharaghani, City of Los Angeles
 Frank Kuo, LACFCD
 Eric Leung, Long Beach Water Department
 Shelley Luce, Santa Monica Bay
 Restoration Commission
 Rich Nagel, West Basin MWD
 Andy Niknafs, LADWP
 Lisa Northrop, US Forest Service
 Melih Ozbilgin, Brown and Caldwell
 Leighanne Reeser, West Basin MWD

Randy Schollerman, San Gabriel Basin
 WQA
 Frances Spiray-Weber, SWRCB
 Nancy Steele, LASGRWC
 Dan Sulzer, Army Corp
 Tim Whorley, RMC
 Tony Zampielo, RBMB
 Mary Zauner, LACSD

Topic/Issue	Discussion	Action/Follow up
1. Welcome, Introductions and Purpose	Diego Cadena called the meeting to order at 9:40 AM with introductions and noted the retirement on Don Wolfe on February 28 th and that Dean will be acting Chair in the interim.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action
2. Review Meeting Summary from January 23, 2008	The minutes from the January Leadership Committee Meeting were distributed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes approved.
3. Public Comment Period	No comments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action
4. IRWM Program News: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Prop. 50, Round 1, \$25m Grant Contract b. Prop. 84 (& 1E) Grant Program Status c. DWR Response to Region's question on the definition of a region d. Revised DWR Los Angeles Sub-region Funding Area Map e. WCVV Response to Region's Prop 84 grant allocation methodology 	<p>Prop 50 Round 1 Going to LA County board for DWR grant in March as well as for MOU with project sponsors. There is a workshop on the afternoon of February 27th for project proponents.</p> <p>Prop 84 Draft guidelines are expected in the Summer of 2008, with a 45 day comment period expected. Planning grants are expected in the end of 2008 and DWR is debating a first come first serve vs. competitive selection for the awarding of grants. Implementation funds would follow in 2009. There is yet to be a ruling on if Prop 84 and 1E will be combined or separate, DWR is leaning toward combining them.</p> <p>Letter from DWR DWR is looking at concept for region and may utilize the Prop 84 guidelines to define</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motion: County will draft letter to Gateway JPA on behalf of the Leadership Committee that will articulate concerns and perspectives and extend offer to meet and discuss issues and encourage continued participation. (Passed Unanimously) • Legislative Subcommittee will hold discussion on policy principal to address what a region is.

	<p>the region. The region has a vested interest in the outcome and should look to influence DWR guidelines as well as comment on the guidelines that DWR makes. This effort should include becoming an active voice in Huffman's bill. The general response by DWR was unclear and raises the importance in moving forward and playing a role in the draft guidelines.</p> <p>DWR Los Angeles Funding Area Map The current DWR funding area map shows the Gateway JPA as a funding area in the region. The Gateway JPA is drafting a letter to DWR on why it should be its own region to influence DWR. There is a lack of communication from the state and there is a need to communicate with DWR on what constitutes a region as well as proposed legislation that affects IRWM programs. There is a desire to work on this issue now because DWR will probably accept the letter from the Gateway JPA meaning the issue will need to be resolved before DWR will allocate funds to the region. In order to do this the region needs to come up with positions/idea/concepts to resolve the issues. So far the County has attempted to outreach to the Gateway JPA and will welcome any other agency that wishes to participate in the outreach.</p> <p>Generally the concerns of the Gateway JPA are self determination (based on the idea that the needs of the JPA are different from the needs of the region and that their needs are not being met and they don't have a voice) and commonality of issues. In addition the JPA feels that the region is currently on a top-down approach, local critical needs aren't being addressed, little projects are getting left out and that the area did not get enough money from the Prop 50 Funding.</p> <p>It was commented that the issues could be addressed through the MOU and Operating Guidelines. However, the exact issues are not known and it would be helpful if their specific concerns were put down in writing so they could be discussed. There was also a feeling that it was unfair to say the Gateway Cities were not fully involved because the process on several occasions had been delayed to address their concerns.</p> <p>Response from WCVC Ventura generally said they want to work on a formula to allocate funds and that population is important but want other factors included. NSMB said they have had an informal dialog with Ventura and expressed the desire to work together. General feeling was that the LC would like to see Ventura propose a counter offer so that a discussion can take place.</p> <p>SCAG Draft Water Component of Regional Plan Interested parties directed to send comments to SCAG.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative Subcommittee will work on strategy for allocating funds with Ventura. • Motion: County will draft letter to Ventura to articulate the Leadership Committee's position of allocating funding on a base plus population not just population, thank the Ventura for their response and ask for a proposal from Ventura on allocating fund. (Passed unanimously)
--	---	---

<p>5. Steering Committee Chair Reports</p>	<p>Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers Did not meet in February</p> <p>South Bay Had discussion on MOU and adopted it with a few minor revisions. Looking at becoming more involved with projects in the subregion including learning more about projects in the subregion and improving projects. Discussed CIP Task as an opportunity to conduct workshops with project proponents to describe and improve projects through comments.</p> <p>Upper Los Angeles River Provided updates on subregional activities including DAC outreach, involving more parties and reengaging parties that have dropped out. Also announced that Mario is moving to a different department in DWP and Andy will get involved with the IRWMP issues.</p> <p>Upper San Gabriel and Rio Hondo Rivers Discussed MOU and Operating Guidelines and provided some additional comments. Also discussed DAC outreach, fund raising issues and having a budget for the program to forecast financial needs.</p> <p>North Santa Monica Bay Has been working on better defining projects. Also moving to get more agencies and non-profits to participate in the process. They are also looking at other grant programs to help fund subregional projects. There will also be an urban runoff conference at Pepperdine on March 5th that evolved out of the IRWMP process.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action
<p>6. Legislative Subcommittee Report</p> <p>a. IRWM Program Guidelines – AB 1489 (Huffman and Wolk)</p>	<p>Discussion occurred on the proposed AB1489 and its role in Prop 84 implementation. The current version is expected to undergo a significant revision and the revision period presents an opportunity for the Leadership Committee to comment on the bill. There was a request that member of the Leadership Committee keeps track of draft amendments to the bill to make sure they are shared with the committee for further discussion. The general feeling was that the bill will be worked on for a few months and will involve negotiations with water agencies and other interests to develop the final bill and provides the opportunity for the Leadership Committee to provide comments on the bill.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative Subcommittee to develop comments to the bill author and DWR for incorporation into Guidelines
<p>7. Funding Commitments for Consultant Services</p>	<p>Rich Nagel provided an update on funding status and thanked all those who had contributed to the on going funding of the program.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action

8. Review of Status of Current Consultant Contract	Contract approved and consultant is moving forward with scope of work.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action
9. 2008 Consultant Activities: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Strategy to update IRWM Plan in 2008 Identifying planning needs (in general and for future Prop. 84/1E planning grant) Disadvantaged Community (DAC) involvement Sub-regional CIP development strategy 	<p>Melih Ozbilgin provided an overview of consultant activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area Managers and County meet biweekly to standardize service and disseminate valid points between subregions. • Will present straw man to subregions covering options for updating the IRWMP to meet Prop 84 requirements. • Will conduct discussions with subregions to identify planning needs based on the needs outlined in the IRWMP. • Will gather input from subregions for DAC outreach • Will present a straw man for subregions to discuss about the CIP Strategy Development. <p>There was also discussion regarding the Statewide DAC Outreach DAC work group and how there wasn't representation from the LA IRWMP in the group. DWR is currently taking recommendations on DAC definition. It is important to have people be a part of the group from the region (Nancy Steele and Joone Lopez volunteered to participate). General feeling is telling the State how money should be spent on outreach to DAC in the region to more effectively get projects online and encourage participation. Desire expressed to see the consultant participate.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action
10. MOU and Operating Guidelines	<p>Ed Means provided an overview of comments received on the MOU and Operating Guideline that were summarized in a short memo. Ed noted there weren't any major comments. There was a comment from MWD on interpretation of language regarding the formation of a RWMG that may require an edit to the language in the MOU. The version Ed presented was noted to be the near to last strike and delete version and will have a matrix of comments and responses.</p> <p>General comments during the meeting included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language be added that additional rules may be added at Steering Committee discretion for Steering Committee participation. • Resolve conflicting language of subregions and watersheds. • The LC will endorse the document and take to respective agencies for approval • If the governing body doesn't approve, they are not a member of the LC • Near final version to take to each agencies respective legal department should be ready by the end of the week • Army Corp asked if participation would be allowed for an agency in multiple regions, clarified it was not an issue for ex-officio members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present finalized MOU and Operating Guidelines to LC Meeting in March for approval.

11. Foundation Funding	Letter submitted to Annenberg for funding. The letter was submitted through the Watershed Council. The final proposal will include a full staff (housed at LA County DPW) for DAC outreach, workshops and supplement the work of the consultant. So far the County has not heard back about submitting a full proposal yet It is hoped that there will be a response before the next LC Meeting.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action
12. Water Management Area Presentation - Sanitation	Sharon Green provided an overview of Los Angeles County Sanitation District's activities in the region including wastewater, ocean discharges, river discharges, spreading grounds, solid waste management, water reuse, and Clearwater Program. Also related the District's efforts to the IRWMP and the importance of addressing issues of aging infrastructure, population growth, upgrades to meet new requirements and recycled water expansion.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action
13. Future Agenda Items / Other Items	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action
14. Meeting Adjournment	The meeting was adjourned at 11:51 AM.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action
15. Next Meeting	Next Leadership Committee meeting on March 26, 2008 9:30 am to 12:00 pm 12 th Floor Executive Conference Room Los Angeles County Flood Control District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action