

IRWMP Leadership Committee

Greater Los Angeles Integrated Regional Water Management Plan
 July 23, 2008 11:15 a.m. to 1:20 p.m.
 Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts
 Joint Water Pollution Control Plant

Present:

Changmii Bae, LA County Parks and Recreation
 Joe Bellemo, Cities of Agoura Hills & Westlake Village
 John Biggs, Brown and Caldwell
 Melih Ozbilgin, Brown and Caldwell
 Hector Bordas, LACFCD
 Diego Cadena, LACFCD
 Barbara Cameron, City of Malibu
 Kathi Delegal, LA County DPW
 Scott Dellinger, Brown and Caldwell
 George De La O, LACFCD

Dean Efstathiou, LACFCD
 Tom Erb, LADWP
 Sharon Green, LACSD
 Mark Horne, PBS&J
 Andree Hunt, Malcolm Pirnie
 Grace Kast, San Gabriel WQA
 Shahram Kharaghani, City of LA, BOS, WPD
 Frank Kuo, LACFCD
 Shelley Luce, SMBRC
 Ed Means, Malcolm Pirnie
 Rich Nagel, West Basin MWD

Andy Niknafs, LADWP
 Leighanne Reeser, West Basin MWD
 Belina Ruiz-Hoffman, LA County Parks and Recreation
 Randy Schoellerman, WQA
 Lester Snow, CA DWR
 Nancy Steele, LASGRWC
 Mark Stuart, CA DWR
 Tom West, RMC Water & Environment
 Carol Williams, MSGBWM
 Tony Zampielo, Raymond Basin

Topic/Issue	Discussion	Action/Follow up
1. Welcome, Introductions and Purpose	Dean Efstathiou opened the meeting at 11:20 a.m. with introductions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action
2. Welcome by the County Sanitation Districts	Ken Rademacher gave a presentation on the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts specifically highlighting the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action
3. Public Comment Period	No public comments given.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action
4. Overview of the Greater Los Angeles County IRWM Region	Due to changes in the agenda, this item was not discussed. Diego Cadena and Dean Efstathiou thanked the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts for hosting the press conference and Leadership Committee meeting.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action
5. Sub-Regional Steering Committee Chair Reports: a. Overview of the Sub-Region b. Current focus of work c. Future activities	South Bay Steering Committee Rich Nagel thanked the Los Angeles County Flood Control District for their leadership in the IRWM Program and for organizing the press conference. The Steering Committee met this month and discussed the disadvantaged community (DAC) outreach noting it was important to define what the IRWM group can do for the DACs. The group also noted that there was a need to be careful when talking to representatives of DAC groups to avoid unduly raising funding expectations and lose the trust of the communities. The Sub-region held a workshop in June where project proponents presented their “most ready to go” project to increase sub-regional stakeholders’ knowledge and familiarity with the projects.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting with Ventura County regarding Prop 84 funding allocations to occur on August 5th.

	<p>Upper Los Angeles River Steering Committee The Steering Committee met in July and discussed project integration. The Committee agreed that there is a large job ahead to get to the project details. The Committee has scheduled a six hour sub-regional workshop to discuss projects, project integration, and DAC projects. It was also stated that a needs assessment needs to be done for DACs.</p> <p>Upper San Gabriel River and Rio Hondo Steering Committee The Steering Committee met in July and focused on discussing DAC outreach, identifying DAC projects, and reviewed the subregional maps showing existing projects and DAC regions. The sub-region plans on continuing the discussion on the development of the DAC Outreach Plan and identifying the needs in DACs.</p> <p>North Santa Monica Bay Steering Committee The Steering Committee met in July and discussed the DAC outreach strategy, noting that the sub-region has a small population and a high per capita income, but the sub-region has 20 million visitors annually and presents opportunities for people living in DACs. Also began engaging Los Angeles County Parks and Recreation staff who work with families and DACs to facilitate meetings and work together to identify park needs for DACs and for the possibility to match with State Parks funds. The Committee is also looking at what other funds stakeholders are pursuing and working on updating lists of grant funding opportunities. It was also reported that the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District recently completed their Urban Runoff Control Program that identified water wasters.</p> <p>Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers Steering Committee The Steering Committee met in July and discussed project prioritization. The Committee also discussed selection of a Vice-Chair, but tabled a decision until the next Steering Committee meeting. It was also suggested that further outreach to stakeholders be conducted to increase participation at the Steering Committee meetings.</p> <p>A side discussion occurred on possible acceleration in Proposition 84/1E funding and that the Steering Committee should be aware that prioritization may have to occur sooner than currently expected. It was also noted that another meeting with Ventura County regarding Proposition 84 funding allocation will occur on August 5, 2008.</p>	
<p>6. Remarks by Lester Snow</p>	<p>Lester Snow spoke to the Leadership Committee covering the following issues facing the California Water System:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action

<p>a. Questions and answers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently in a drought with a 2nd year in a row with low snow pack. • Runoff approximately 2/3 of normal. • Experiencing a change in weather patterns. • State has relied on water storage for the last two years and storage is now lower than at the end of the 1976-1977 water year. • This drought could be worse because of increased demand, decreased storage carryover, and less flexibility in the delivery system. • Southern California lost some of its Colorado River water supply. • Working to get Proposition 84 money appropriated. • Working on investment in conservation, specifically grants for conservation programs. • Looking to reinvest in the State system in the following ways: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Increased Regional Investment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Additional \$2 billion for IRWMP - \$500 million for regional and local conveyance ○ Delta Sustainability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - \$1.2 billion for eco-restoration - \$700 million for infrastructure improvements ○ Increasing Storage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - \$3 billion for major storage projects - Focus on projects with public benefits - Groundwater and surface water storage eligible ○ Working on NEPA/CEQA for Delta Canal ○ Supportive of projects for groundwater cleanup (like the San Fernando Groundwater Basin Project) and river restoration (Los Angeles River Restoration) ○ Looking at programs for rehabilitation of burned watersheds. ○ Attempting to get a Bond on the November Ballot; to form an initiative committee if the Legislature doesn't approve for the November Ballot. ○ Early surveying has found high support for the water bond, with support above 60 percent when presented with negative messaging. <p>Lester Snow conducted a question and answer session that included the following:</p> <p>Q With the need to meet water quality TMDLS is there money earmarked for Los Angeles and Los Angeles River revitalization?</p> <p>A Some money was allocated in Proposition 84 and there is also funding recommendations in the proposed water bond, including</p>	
---------------------------------	--	--

	<p>money to Regional Water Quality Control Board.</p> <p>Q Why was there no money in the water bond for the Delta Canal? How will it be funded?</p> <p>A The water bond pays for activities around the Delta no matter what. The cost of canal construction will go to the water users.</p> <p>Q Will bond money go to fixing the Delta levees?</p> <p>A Yes, there is money in 1E and additional money in the water bond to strengthen critical levees. Levees that need repair will be identified and repairs made. Others will be managed until replaced by a better alternative.</p> <p>Q Proposition 84 allocates \$210 million to Los Angeles, but the funding area is Los Angeles and Ventura County. Is there any way to split the region before funding? Also could work be done through legislation to divide funding before bond is passed?</p> <p>A Don't know how easy it would be to divide up regions and don't want more funding areas. Generally the focus now is on getting the bond out, getting it raised to the Legislature, and getting the 2/3 vote to pass it and get it on the November ballot.</p> <p>Q What insight and guidance can you provided on dividing and sharing Proposition 84 funds in the funding region?</p> <p>A Understand that in the process there was some intent in putting the regions together. Considering Ventura is its own reason look for reasons to stay together through mutual benefit without giving up to much. With the Gateway Group, work together while still addressing local planning needs.</p> <p>Q What guidance can you provide on the Gateway Group?</p> <p>A Keep up a dialog with the group, keep the region together, and keep working at regional planning.</p> <p>Q What steps are being taken to better understand, measure, and track success? The State has funded watershed valuation and there is a desire to expand the program, but don't have the additional funding. Is there a plan to use existing and new funds to continue the program?</p> <p>A Have to design monitoring into the project. The Legislature looks at planning and monitoring as wasted money, but still wants to know the benefit of the bonds. Water quality data would be useful in the system.</p> <p>Q How should region-wide monitoring be done, especially with projects not in the IRWMP? How is progress towards regional goals tracked?</p> <p>A Don't have a good answer. Answers should come in the IRWM Plan and incorporate monitoring for the region. Hopefully, local</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>money can fill in as the region has a lot of needs and assets. It is important to note that the region needs to continually evolve the IRWM Plan.</p> <p>Q How much do DWR and RWQCB work together? There is a good model from both, but want direct guidance on working together for solutions.</p> <p>A There has been a collaborative approach from the State Board, especially in the State Water Plan which includes scenario planning, flood management, climate change, risk & uncertainty, and water quality. Staff from the State Board is helping on the water quality piece for the State Water Plan. Still working on better communication at the regional level.</p> <p>Q In the case of recycled water projects, cities and county develop local water supplies realizing other supplies are at risk, but with all the regulations from DHS and the State Board it takes a lot of time to implement. What advice can you offer on how to proceed with recycled water projects?</p> <p>A There will be a time when we won't be able to afford to dump waste water and it will need to be put back into the system. Working on improving the process for getting recycled water projects off the ground.</p> <p>Q What will happen with the call the Governor made in January for 20 percent conservation by 2020?</p> <p>A The Legislature has a bill in the works, but it still has some rough spots. DWR realizes that all per capita rates are not equal and is working on coming up with equitable conservation rates instead of flat rates and appeals.</p> <p>Q What will the base year be for the conservation goals?</p> <p>A Do not know as not involved in the determination of the base year.</p> <p>Q For agencies with existing good conservation, how will the base year be determined?</p> <p>A Do not know at this point in time.</p> <p>Q In terms of watershed area RMC has a lot of urban territory and note that it is important to partner with local project sponsors. In the current grant cycle there are more projects than money available and don't want to see big projects use all of the money, but watersheds and local agencies should get equitable share of funds.</p> <p>A Some money is earmarked, but there is opportunity to further define guidelines.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Q Is there a push to get Proposition 84 money moving? There is a lot of demand and projects in the pipeline. What will the first round look like and is the time frame still two to three years?</p> <p>A The first round of Proposition 84 may use old guidelines. The second round will probably use Huffman Guidelines and may include modification or plans based on amendments and plan criteria.</p> <p>Q Will there be appropriations this year to meet guidelines?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p>Q Was the money stripped out of the governor's budget?</p> <p>A Bill XX1 in special session with bond money in the bill. Not sure when the funds will come out. It could be 90 days to one year.</p> <p>Q If DWR doesn't want 22 regions, is there support for regions on hydrologic basis and will the guidelines support/incentivize process? Also, if the first round is based on existing guidelines, will there be an acceptance process/verification?</p> <p>A Huffman requires update to plan before funds, but won't make it a requirement for the first round of funds. May also postpone acceptance/verification.</p>	
<p>7. 2008 Action Plan Review/Update</p> <p>a. Update to water supply targets</p> <p>b. MOU and Operating Guidelines</p> <p>c. Update to IRWM Plan, future planning needs</p>	<p>Melih Ozbilgin reviewed the status of the following topics in the Consultant Scope of Work:</p> <p>Action Plan Action plan was distributed and reviewed noting it was a moving plan that will be updated based on changes from the State.</p> <p>Project Database The Consulting team is working with the County and West Basin Municipal Water District to finalize the deliverables, scope, and budget.</p> <p>DAC Outreach The Consulting team is collecting comments on the Draft DAC Outreach Plan. Finalizing the plan is on hold until the group forming to provide comments on how to implement the plan conducts their meeting.</p> <p>Ed Means reviewed the status on the following topics in the Consultant Scope of Work:</p> <p>Water Supply Gap</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide comments on Water Supply Gap to Ed Means.

	<p>The team had revisited the water supply targets based on six scenarios and developed a technical memorandum discussing the assumptions and results. There is still to be a review of the findings with water managers and the Leadership Committee to identify what scenario makes the most sense. Also noted that the recycled water component has been broken out as a separate item and the total water supply need has increased under the worst case scenario evaluated. The technical memorandum will be distributed for comments leading to a conference call and finalization.</p> <p>Discussion occurred on the Water Supply Gap and covered the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three elements of water supply for the region: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Outside Supply ○ Internal Supply ○ Recycled Water • 2/3 of the region's water supply comes from outside the area • Clarified that the 47 percent used in the technical memo represents the LA Region's percentage of the population within MWD's planning area and is used to prorate Metropolitan Water District's (MWD) forecasted water demands. • Noted that if Urban Water Management Plans in the region are added up, it would not result in the same figures as developed from MWD's Integrated Resource Plan because Metropolitan Water District builds a planning buffer into their projections and the two plans share different dry year assumptions. • Noted the importance of using the most relevant number that we have in the region. Also that the MWD numbers were used to be consistent with MWD's projections. In addition, it is important to note that the world of water is constantly changing and projections are imperfect. • Noted that there is a reasonable possibility of water rationing in the next year, but rationing can also create opportunities. • Requested that the data also be translated into a per capita reduction to make the information easier to communicate. Also requested that the numbers be explained better. • Need to increase the use of recycled water. • Need a common understanding of assumption and the areas of water being talked about. <p>Requested that any additional comments on the Water Supply Technical Memorandum be provided to Ed Means.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>MOU and Operating Guidelines To date 7 of 16 Leadership Committee Members have signed or been given their board authorization to sign. The deadline clock has not started yet, but is expected to shortly.</p>	
8. Meeting Adjournment	Meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action
9. Next Meeting:	<p>Wednesday, August 27, 2008 9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. (May Be Cancelled) 12th Floor Executive Conference Room Los Angeles County Flood Control District</p> <p>Wednesday, September 24, 2008 9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. 12th Floor Executive Conference Room Los Angeles County Flood Control District</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action