

Greater Los Angeles Integrated Regional Water Management Plan
Upper Los Angeles River Watershed
August 9th 2006, 10 am to 12 pm
LADWP Conference Room 1471

Present:

Mario Acevedo, LA DWP
 Mary Benson, LA Trails
 Shirley Birosik, LA RWQCB
 Brad Bowman, South Pasadena
 Lisa Carlson, LA BOS
 Michael Drennan, Brown and Caldwell

Renee Ellis, City of LA
 Terri Grant, LA County DPW
 Mark Horne, Brown and Caldwell
 Chris Kroll, Coastal Conservancy (via
 conference phone)
 Frank Kuo, LA County DPW

Mark Lavin, Brown and Caldwell
 Mark Mackowski, Watermaster
 Nancy Steele, LASG Watershed
 Melanie Winter, River Project

Topic/Issue	Reports/Recommendations	Discussion	Action/Follow up
1. Welcome & Introductions	Tom Erb welcomed everyone at 10:10.	Everyone introduced themselves	
2. July Meeting Minutes		Mario Acevedo noted the new meeting minutes format.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mario requested comments from the Steering Committee on the minutes. • The group approved the minutes.
3. Comments on August 2 Workshop		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great attendance at the Workshop. • Mary Benson said the workshop was excellent. Trash recyclers were excited and they see the IRWMP as an opportunity to meet tough new standards while increasing recycled water. The LA River Revitalization team was very enthusiastic. • Melanie praised workshop structure and said the breakout groups were productive and intentional. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BC will make a transcript of breakout group comments available on the website on 8/9. • Michael Drennan requested feedback that would forward development of an effective October Workshop. • Handouts and presentation materials are now on www.lawaterplan.org.
4. Input on the Three Proposed Scenarios	Review the scenarios and comment on each element	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mark Horne summarized the process and assumptions behind the scenarios. He also requested input on the appropriateness of the scenarios and applicability to Upper LA. • Chris Kroll was concerned that not all of the targets will be achieved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BC will provide a summary of the assumptions behind each scenario. • The consultant team will suggest a 2-phase planning process to the

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

	and determine applicability by region.	<p>with each scenario.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestions on the scenarios included: acknowledge existing flood control facilities may be replaced with more multi-purpose and green infrastructure. Emphasize benefits and the Regional economic engine the plan will support. Consider changing “scenarios” to “approaches.” Consider a new name for treatment wetland to include other natural treatment systems. • Melanie described a 1915 County report which suggested dedicating 3,100 spreading acres in Tujunga to avoid channelizing the LA River. Today 1200 acres of open space must be dedicated per Sun Valley area landfill agreements. Public land in Pacoima can be acquired with little impact. However, open space and habitat alone appear unlikely so far to provide 800,000 acre-feet, and developers find loopholes. Subdivisions proposed in the National Forest would channelize more streams. There needs to be a guarantee that open space can be preserved. Incorporating city planning into the IRWMP was suggested. • Melanie: require developments to capture and recharge on-site and reduce streams to traditional flow levels so they can be naturalized. • Other suggestions: Use onsite BMPs, recharge and flood retention upstream in addition to green infrastructure. All the open space does not have to come through IRWMP. Perhaps cost estimates can include only retrofits. • There was general consensus to put develop a long range (100 year) vision which would inform the IRWMP’s 20-year plan. Ecosystem services could eventually meet all goals. • Tom Erb requested input regarding various possible options for long term governance, and who would maintain projects long term. Mary suggested taking note of the concurrent LA River Revitalization governance discussions. 	Leadership Committee, acknowledging the importance of a long range (100 year) vision that would inform the 20 year plan.
5. Implementation Plan		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chris and Melanie suggested using the scenarios to define vision for each sub-region. • Shirley suggested developing projects now in anticipation of the next call for projects anticipated in 2007 under Proposition 50, Round 2. • Melanie suggested being proactive; develop appropriate solutions and assume future funding will support them. 	

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"> • Shirley suggested that scenarios, governance and integration be developed at the watershed level. Nancy said a hybrid with the current sub-regional system might work. The current ad-hoc structure of Subregions allows projects to be submitted outside of existing watershed management plans (such as Sun Valley or Tujunga). Brad said project integration can be evaluated at watershed level, but the Leadership Committee will need to work with Steering Committees and look at region-wide, sub-regional and watershed scale projects. • Brad suggested empowering the Leadership Committee to authorize and fund projects, and not await DWR approval. • A Southern California Cal-Fed was suggested. • The “what’s next” discussion will strive for recommendations over the next few months. 	
6. Comments on the Draft MOU		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State MOU requirements are unclear. Is the MOU an item on a checklist or should it define governance? Frank Kuo has been in discussions with DWR, but has not received much direction from them on this issue. Shirley said that literally the state requires a Regional Water Management Group of three agencies, two with Water Quality authority, to sign that the Plan has been adopted. • The Draft MOU seems premature, rigid, and wouldn’t be signed in time by everyone. Alternate proposals included a network of MOUs between entities or an acknowledgement of cooperation that saves definition of governance until later. 	There was general agreement at the Steering Committee to sign an MOU that declares the intention to collaborate and makes clear that long-term governance structures will be developed.
7. Upcoming Meetings/Workshops			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next Meeting – Sep 13th, @ LADWP. • Next sub-regional workshop Sep 21, 9:00 am.

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