

IRWMP Leadership Committee

Greater Los Angeles Integrated Regional Water Management Plan
 October 22, 2008 9:30 a.m. to 12 p.m.
 Los Angeles County Flood Control District
 12th Floor Executive Conference Room

Present:

Michael Antos, LASGRWC
 John Biggs, Brown and Caldwell
 Hector Bordas, LACFCD
 Diego Cadena, LACFCD
 Barbara Cameron, City of Malibu
 Donna Chen, City of LA, BOS, WPD
 Kathi Delegal, LA County DPW
 George De La O, LACFCD
 Joyce Dillard
 Tom Erb, LADWP
 Norma Garcia, LA Co Parks and Recreation

Sharon Green, LACSD
 Mark Horne, PBS&J
 Michael Hurley, Malcolm Pirnie
 Grace Kast, San Gabriel WQA
 Shahram Kharaghani, City of LA, BOS, WPD
 Frank Kuo, LACFCD
 Shelley Luce, SMBRC
 Rich Nagel, West Basin MWD
 Sherwood Natsuhara, City of Vernon
 Andy Niknafs, LADWP
 Randal Orton, Las Virgenes MWD

Melih Ozbilgin, Brown and Caldwell
 Mark Pestrella, LACFCD
 Leighanne Reeser, West Basin MWD
 Randy Schoellerman, WQA
 Nancy Steele, LASGRWC
 Tom West, RMC
 Carol Williams, MSGBWM
 Tim Worley, RMC
 Tony Zampielo, Raymond Basin
 Mary Zauner, LACSD

Topic/Issue	Discussion	Action/Follow up
1. Welcome, Introductions and Purpose	Diego Cadena opened the meeting at 9:48 a.m. with introductions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action
2. Approval Meeting Summary from September 24, 2008	Minutes from the September Leadership Committee Meeting were distributed and reviewed. Minutes were approved with the noted changes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes Approved with noted changes
3. Public Comment Period	Public Comment was given that the Leadership Committee should do outreach to spread the word about the IRWMP. Also noted that people attending the meeting shouldn't be required to show ID when entering the LA County Public Works Building because it could scare some people away from the meetings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment Noted.
4. IRWM Program News <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Proposition 50, Round 1, \$25 million Grant b. Proposition 84 & 1E Grant Program and SBxx1 	<p>Prop 50 The County is going live on October 22 with the web reporting system for Prop 50 project proponents. The State is reviewing the County invoicing system and working on a totally electronic transfer of invoices. The goal is to get the system to be usable for all future grants and to simplify the process. Also noted that the quarterly report to DWR for July to September progress is due by the end of October. Request was made that there be project status updates at the Leadership Committee Meetings to keep the region informed of the progress.</p> <p>Prop 84 & 1E and Bill SBxx1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • George De La O will attend the Roundtable of Regions Meeting.

	<p>Handout from DWR providing an overview of SBxx1 was distributed to the Leadership Committee for review. It was noted that the guidelines for implementation will be expedited and should be out by the end of 2008 or the beginning of 2009, with applications due in the spring of 2009. Grant awards are anticipated in June 2009. Guidelines for planning grants expected in late summer or early fall 2009. It was noted that a condition of award for the implementation grants will be to commit to update the IRWM Plan within 2 years from the award date. It was also noted that some portions of the plan might need to be updated earlier and paid by the region. Leadership Committee members agreed that it is important to continue efforts to prioritize projects as well as project integration, and DAC outreach.</p> <p><i>Regional Acceptance Program</i> DWR is reviewing and setting guidelines for process. The schedule for the Regional Acceptance Process will be approximately the same as the schedule for the implementation grants.</p> <p><i>Roundtable of Regions</i> Roundtable of Regions meeting is scheduled in Sacramento on November 12, 2008. A suggestion for question for the meeting was made on when proponents can begin to incur costs that are reimbursable. There was also a suggestion for a question of why there weren't any earmarks for Los Angeles in SBxx1.</p>	
<p>5. Water Conservation Package</p>	<p>Rich Nagel gave a presentation and conducted a discussion on the opportunity for a Region-wide water conservation package.</p> <p>The basis for the water conservation package was the target to achieve the Governor's goal of 20% Conservation by 2020. Rich distributed handouts highlighting the information regarding the baseline water use and conservation goals for the 9 hydrologic regions in the State. The South Cost Region had base line of 180 GPCD. However, MWD sent a letter to the State demonstrating that the region's baseline should be 192 GPCD, utilizing their actual data from 1995 to 2005. This will set the region's targets to be 172 GPCD in 2015 (10% Conservation) and 154 GPCD in 2020 (20% Conservation).</p> <p>The State group is working on formulas for what counts as water conservation. A specific issue related to the recycled water usage is of concern where the credits for recycled water irrigation are allowed, but no credits for using recycled water for groundwater recharge are given. General feeling was that recycled water for groundwater recharge should count toward the overall conservation goal.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motion made and passed to form Ad Hoc Committee on water conservation with the Steering Committee Chairs appointing at least 1 person to be on the Committee. Meeting should take place before the November 12th Roundtable of Regions. It was requested that list of volunteers be emailed to George De La O.

	<p>Relating the conservation initiative of 20% by 2020 to the SBxx1, there is \$20,000,000 earmarked in competitive grants for conservation implementation. It was noted that, for conservation projects, there are four potential courses of action for the Region:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Put together a water conservation package tied to the 2020 goals targeting the conservation grants • Go through subregional project selection process to pursue specific project implementation grants, recognizing that the funding needs to be realistic based on available funds. • Put forth a water conservation package and some other really good projects for implementation projects. • Wait for future grant funding allocations. <p>Discussion on a water conservation package covered the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation package should be for at least \$5,000,000 and needs to be flexible to pull together multiple strategies and share resources. • It should clarify if there will be funding gaps on the first round of implementation grants. • A question was raised on weather the pure water conservation actions meet the IRWMP’s multi-benefit goals. It was noted that it may depend on specific project implementation. It was pointed out that water conservation can have a direct connection to other benefits such as habitat. • It was noted that MWD has given money to groups doing water recycling. A question was raised on weather MWD will categorize recycled water recharge as conserved water. • Water conservation could be a really strong project for DAC Communities, noting that this could tie into the \$70,000,000 earmarked for DACs as well. • It was commented that the program should target all categories for all potential funding opportunities, such as the \$400,000,000 parks bond. • It was suggested that the group should start the process to get a head start by forming a subgroup made up from at least one representative from each subregion to compile thoughts for a conservation package possibly with consultant facilitation. • A need to identify the State guidelines on what constitutes a water conservation project was raised. A question was raised on weather the state is looking at this as “traditional” water conservation. If so, the Region would need to make a good case for the proposed package using some traditional methods as well. • A framework should be developed on how to proceed, focusing on the package as a resource for the region not just an earmark for specific 	
--	--	--

<p>6. SWRCB's Recycled Water Policy – Basin Plan Update</p>	<p>projects.</p> <p>Rich Nagel reviewed the SWRCB Recycled Water Policy developed by stakeholders from the water and environmental community with the specific goals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify roles of Regional Boards and Department of Public Health • Streamline recycled water projects (particularly irrigation) • Update Basin Plans within 5 years especially in regards to nutrient and salt loadings. <p>As a result of the policy there may be a “free pass” on anti-degradation policy until 2015 on recycled water projects. In addition the Regional Board will begin to conduct triennial review of Basin Plans. Funding for Basin Plans are available from DWR for \$20,000,000 under Proposition 84. Stakeholders should get ready to seek funding specifically for implementing projects for groundwater recharge.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request Regional Board presentation on Basin Plans and Recycled Water Policy.
<p>7. Steering Committee Chair Reports:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Disadvantaged Community Outreach b. Planning Needs / Project Prioritization / Workshop c. IRWMP Update 	<p>Upper Los Angeles River Steering Committee Steering Committee is working on identifying 2 DAC projects and narrowed down to organizations to seek interest in participation. The Committee is also proceeding to work on project prioritization.</p> <p>South Bay Steering Committee The Steering Committee met and discussed SBxx1, development of a region wide water conservation package, and worked on DAC outreach by sending letters to City Managers to discuss DAC opportunities.</p> <p>Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers Steering Committee Steering Committee is working on identifying active projects in the subregion with the intent towards project workshops and project presentations to inform the committee to begin prioritization and integration.</p> <p>North Santa Monica Bay Steering Committee Steering Committee discussed planning needs and the need to meet subregional planning needs and how to get to where they want to go. The Committee discussed the next steps the group needs to take in project prioritization. Committee discussed developing a new project for subregion-wide water conservation and water quality. The Committee is also working to coordinate with Ventura County to pursue cross regional grants with Ventura. The committee also wanted an update on the discussions with the Gateway JPA and the Watershed Coalition of Ventura County.</p> <p>Upper San Gabriel and Rio Hondo Rivers Steering Committee The Steering Committee met with San Gabriel Valley COG subcommittee to help them learn more about the process and to foster working together and support. The</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request Art Aguilar to give an update on outreach to the Gateway Cities.

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>Committee also discussed the potential for water conservation funding for a regional conservation project.</p> <p>Gateway Cities IRWM JPA Representatives of LA County (Mark Pestrella and Diego Cadena), LSGLA Steering Committee (Art Aguilar), and Gateway Cities IRWM JPA (Kevin Wattier and Desi Alvarez) met and discussed support reaching out to the Gateway Cities and encouraging active participation of the Gateway Cities in the LSGLA Subregion. It was noted that their participation in the subregion is important to represent their needs in the IRWMP. The Leadership Committee discussed the next steps in outreach to the Gateway Cities JPA with the primary focus on working on outreach through the subregion and participation through the existing IRWMP Structure.</p> <p>Watershed Coalition of Ventura County and Upper Santa Clara River Watershed The groups have not met recently, but the County has presented data to support funding allocation method to Ventura County. Currently awaiting comments from Ventura County regarding the data provided.</p>	
<p>8. 2008 Consultant Activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Update to IRWM Plan in 2008 b. Planning Needs / Project Prioritization c. Highlights “Lite” Document d. Disadvantaged Community Involvement e. MOU and Operating Guidelines f. Draft Action Plan g. Water Supply Gap Analysis h. Meeting Support 	<p>Melih Ozbilgin reviewed the following consultant activities:</p> <p>Action Plan Current action plan on hold for revision as DWR sets up guidelines based on the signing of SBxx1. Noted that the plan and scope is flexible to support the needs of Region moving forward.</p> <p>IRWMP Update Task is on hold until the DWR Guidelines are published. Discussions on update strategy will continue to prepare for grant funding cycles and required IRWMP Updates.</p> <p>Planning Needs Distributed copies of the Planning Needs Technical Memo that summarized the planning needs in the original IRWMP and incorporated subregional input on additional planning needs. Further planning needs pushed back based on SBxx1 and DWR Guidelines. Members are invited to review and comment on the TM, noting that there are lots of needs to pick from and the list will be narrowed based on State Requirements.</p> <p>Interim DAC Outreach Plan Tabled for Action Item as Agenda Item 10.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consulting team will follow up on question regarding Water Supply TM and brief the Leadership Committee Meeting if there are any substantial changes.

	<p>MOU & Operating Guidelines Last agencies are working to get the document signed.</p> <p>Water Supply Gap Analysis Distributed Water Supply Gap Analysis to Leadership Committee for review and acceptance. Received a comment from Long Beach yesterday and are in the process of reviewing to determine if it will require revision.</p> <p>Meeting Support Noted that the current scope provides for support of 10 Steering Committee meetings in each subregion and 10 Leadership Committee meetings that will be running out in November.</p>	
9. Ongoing IRWMP Funding Status	Rich Nagle distributed and reviewed a summary of pledged contributions and collected balance of funds. Noted in the contribution there is approximately \$130,000 in unscoped dollars.	•
10. Interim DAC Outreach Plan	<p>Motion made and approved unanimously to adopt the Interim DAC Outreach Plan.</p> <p>North Santa Monica Bay commented that their participation is difficult due to the lack of DAC in their area. It was noted that DACs are served indirectly by their subregion. They would like to know if DACs in other areas had expressed their use of the subregion. In addition, they want to know what to do with DAC outreach money allocated to their subregion.</p>	• Motion made and approved unanimously to adopt Interim DAC Outreach Plan
11. New Alternate for Open Space Water Management Area	Shelley Luce introduced Norma Garcia to serve as the Open Space Water Management Area Representative Alternate. Motion made and passed unanimously to appoint Norma Garcia as the Open Space WMA Representative Alternate.	• Norma Garcia approved unanimously as Open Space WMA Alternate.
12. Future Agenda Items / Other Items	Closed Session.	• No Action
13. Meeting Adjournment	Meeting Adjourned at 11:57 am.	• No Action
14. Next Meeting:	LA IRWMP Leadership Committee: Los Angeles County Public Works, Wednesday, November 26, 2008, 9:30 am – 12:00 pm	• No Action

Integrated Regional Water Management Roundtable of Regions

Survey Results November 10, 2008



The Roundtable of Regions conducted an on-line survey in July and August 2008. The purpose of this survey was to gather information from regions throughout the State regarding their IRWM planning efforts and obtain input on best practices for future efforts. This summarizes the results of the survey.

1 & 5. Name of Region and Date IRWMP Adopted

Region	Date IRWMP Adopted
Solano County	02/01/2005
Santa Barbara County	05/01/2007
Coachella Valley IRWMP	07/09/2008
Watersheds Coalition of Ventura County.....	12/01/2006
Four County.....	2005
Salinas Valley	06/01/2006
Northern Santa Cruz County.....	12/01/2005
Inyo-Mono (Eastern Sierra)	Currently we are in our Launch phase
American River Basin.....	05/01/2006
Upper Feather River.....	06/30/2005
Four County.....	05/01/2005
Upper Santa Clara River	07/30/2008
Cosumnes American Bear Yuba	December 2006, Updated August, 2007
Tulare Lake Basin (Funding Area)-Poso Creek IRWMP (Region)	07/26/2007
Pajaro River Watershed.....	05/01/2007
San Diego	10/01/2007
San Francisco Bay Area	11/01/2006
Yuba County IRWM Plan.....	02/01/2008
Eastern San Joaquin County.....	7/25/07
Gateway Region IRWM Joint Powers Authority JPA signed 10/11/07; IRWMP in progress	
South Sierra IRWMP	N/A
Greater Los Angeles County Region	12/13/2006
Tahoe Sierra IRWMP	July 2006
Mokelumne Amador Calaveras.....	November 2006
Santa Ana Watershed.....	2005
San Luis Obispo County	July 2007
North Coast IRWMP.....	July 2005; Updated & Re-Adopted July 2007
Monterey Peninsula, Carmel Bay, and South Monterey Bay	November 2007

6. What type of agreement is used in your region's governance structure for ongoing IRWM planning efforts (Please check one)?

Answer	Response Percent	Response Count
JPA	4	20%
MOU	15	75%
Contract or Other Agreement	1	5%
Other	7	
Total	20	

Other Answers:

- 1) Region is boundary of Solano County Water Agency
- 2) TBD
- 3) SF Bay Area IRWM Plan
- 4) Board resolutions of support to form RWMG and develop IRWMP
- 5) MOU is under consideration at the moment
- 6) We applied as a Regional Agency with other agencies adopting the IRWM Plan
- 7) Memorandum of Mutual Understandings

7. Are all of your IRWM participants signatories to the governance agreement?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	33.3%	8
No	66.7%	16
<i>answered question</i>		24
<i>skipped question</i>		4

8. Do you attempt to reach a broad and diverse group of stakeholders as part of your IRWM planning process?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	26
No	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		26
<i>skipped question</i>		2

9. Do you feel these efforts have been successful?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	88%	23
No	12%	3
<i>answered question</i>		26
<i>skipped question</i>		2

10. How will you bring more stakeholders to the table in the future? Check all that apply:

Answers	Response Percent	Response Count
Pay them to participate (for their time to attend meetings)	13%	3
Change meeting schedule to accommodate people that work during the day	39%	9
Hold small, local meetings across the region on specific topics	91%	21
Make a personal effort to encourage participation (i.e. follow-up phone calls)	87%	20
Invite them to serve as co-chairs or steering committee members	44%	10
Other	48%	11
Answered Question		23

Other answers:

- 1) Hold some meetings outside the work day
- 2) Hold public workshops
- 3) Provide stipends for meeting participation; targeted outreach
- 4) Establish separate stakeholder group committee
- 5) Participate in implementing projects
- 6) We are still working on this area
- 7) to be determined; additional outreach
- 8) We are in the process of coming up with a stakeholder outreach plan
- 9) Media outreach
- 10) Outreach to DACs and specific groups
- 11) Utilize webtools for virtual meetings

11. Check the types of entities involved in your planning effort and whether they are in an advisory or decision making capacity:

Answer Options	Advisory only	Decision making	Response Count
Water districts	4	21	25
Irrigation districts	9	7	16
Local government (cities, counties)	9	18	26
Flood control districts	8	10	18
Watershed groups	12	9	20
General public	18	3	21
State agencies	17	4	21
Federal agencies	17	3	20
Non-governmental entities (i.e. non-profits, environmental groups, environmental justice groups)	15	8	23
Sanitary districts or wastewater agencies	9	12	21
Other special districts	12	4	16
Resource conservation districts	16	9	25
Tribes	7	2	9
Other (please specify)			3
<i>answered question</i>			26
<i>skipped question</i>			2

Other Answers:

- 1) Groundwater Management Districts - Decision Making
- 2) I used the following criteria in answering this question: our three RWMG agencies, which actually adopted our IRWM Plan, are the decision-makers. But all the others mentioned above are part of our Regional Advisory Committee, which had a formal role in recommending the plan to the RWMG agencies and the projects that we submitted for funding.
- 3) While all these have been invited to participate in decision-making, not all have yet

12. Has your region established measurable targets or outcomes (performance measures) for your IRWM plan objectives?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	50%	13
No	50%	13

13. Do you think that regions should establish numeric targets or focus on qualitative performance measures, which can be measured, for reporting purposes?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Qualitative	15.4%	5
Quantitative	0%	0
A combination of both	84.6%	22
<i>answered question</i>		26
<i>skipped question</i>		2

14. In your opinion, how prescriptive should the revised IRWM Plan standards be with regard to establishing and monitoring performance measures statewide?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Prescriptive standard approach	8%	2
Provide guidance/Flexible	92%	24
<i>answered question</i>		26
<i>skipped question</i>		2

15. Have you directly addressed climate change in your current IRWM Plan?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	12.5%	3
No	87.5%	21
<i>answered question</i>		24
<i>skipped question</i>		4

16. If yes, do you have specific projects in your plan to address climate change?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	38.5%	5
No	61.5%	8
<i>answered question</i>		13
<i>skipped question</i>		15

17. Have you directly addressed energy use as it relates to implementation of water management strategies in your current IRWM Plan?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	12.5%	3
No	87.5%	21
<i>answered question</i>		24
<i>skipped question</i>		4

18. If yes, do you have specific projects in your plan to address reductions in energy use ?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	30%	3
No	70%	7
<i>answered question</i>		10
<i>skipped question</i>		18

19. Do partner agencies within your IRWM Region coordinate IRWM planning with City/County general plans or other land use plans and planning processes in your area?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	88%	22
No	12%	3
<i>answered question</i>		25

20. Do your county or cities general plans contain the optional water element?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	21%	5
No	29%	7
Don't Know	50%	12
<i>answered question</i>		24
<i>skipped question</i>		4

21. If your IRWM Plan does not coordinate with local general plans, are you addressing land use policies in your IRWM plan?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	30%	3
No	70%	7
<i>answered question</i>		10
<i>skipped question</i>		18

22. If there is more than one IRWM planning region in your Funding Area (under Prop. 84), are you working together to ensure cooperation and integration?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	96%	23
No	4%	1
<i>answered question</i>		24
<i>skipped question</i>		4

23. Have you or another planning region reached out to areas within your Funding Area that do not have an IRWM plan (or one in progress)?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	92%	22
No	8%	2
<i>answered question</i>		24
<i>skipped question</i>		4

24. If there are overlapping planning regions in your area, are you working together?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	58%	14
No	4%	1
Planning regions don't overlap	38%	9
<i>answered question</i>		24
<i>skipped question</i>		4

25. If yes to questions 23 or 24, how are you working together? Check all that apply:

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Developing projects together	39%	7
Meeting at the staff level	100%	18
Meeting at a board/management level	33%	6
Minimal contact	6%	1
Exchanging IRWM plans	83%	15
Other (please specify)		1
	<i>answered question</i>	18
	<i>skipped question</i>	10

Other Answers:

- 1) Attend each other's RWMG meetings

26. What process are you using to identify future projects? Check all that apply:

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Individual entities submit projects	96%	22
Regional Water Management Group recommends projects	70%	16
Other (please specify)		5
	<i>answered question</i>	23
	<i>skipped question</i>	5

Other Answers:

- 1) We are in the early stages of our IRWM planning. We expect to employ a process comprising of both of the boxes in Question 26
- 2) staff meetings to develop projects
- 3) project sponsor within region notifies Regional Water Management Group
- 4) All entities are encouraged to submit with Steering Committee to review and recommend approval by lead agency
- 5) Holding local community meetings with potential project proponents throughout the region

27. What process are you using to prioritize and select future projects for funding? Check all that apply:

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Formal, detailed process with group-approved, weighted criteria	73%	16
Informal consensus based on group agreement	46%	10
Other (please specify)		3
<i>answered question</i>		22
<i>skipped question</i>		6

Other Answers:

- 1) Not determined yet
- 2) Readiness to Proceed (according to criteria)
- 3) Most closely meet state guidelines and priorities

28. Are there projects on your list that are integrated – meeting multiple objectives and/or water management strategies?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	96%	23
No	4%	1
<i>answered question</i>		24
<i>skipped question</i>		4

29. Do projects with multiple sponsors including NGOs receive higher priority for project selection?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	38%	8
No	32%	13
<i>answered question</i>		21
<i>skipped question</i>		7

30. How is your IRWM program funded? Check all that apply:

Answer Options	IRWM Planning Efforts:	IRWM Implementation Efforts:	Response Count
Membership dues	6	5	7
Local assessment fees	1	2	2
Cost share distributed either uniformly or based on size	5	3	6
Cost share based on ability to pay (some stakeholders pay nothing)	8	5	9
In-kind match of staff time and resources	18	17	20
Grants	16	19	22
<i>answered question</i>			24
<i>skipped question</i>			4

Please address how non-governmental entities participate in the funding and project selection process (i.e. contribute funds toward ongoing cost of regional water management group, in order to submit projects for funding).

31. Do they pay to participate?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	5%	1
No	95%	20
<i>answered question</i>		21
<i>skipped question</i>		7

32. Do they get to participate in the project selection process?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	80%	16
No	20%	4
<i>answered question</i>		20
<i>skipped question</i>		8

33. Can they submit projects for consideration in the plan?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	22
No	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		22
<i>skipped question</i>		6

34. Are all participants treated the same in terms of insurance, liability, reporting requirements, assurances for operation?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	50%	11
No	9%	2
Don't Know	41%	9
<i>answered question</i>		22
<i>skipped question</i>		6

35. Is your region integrating local watershed management plans into your IRWM planning efforts?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	83%	19
No	17%	4
<i>answered question</i>		23
<i>skipped question</i>		5

36. What is your Region's annual budget related to the ongoing IRWM planning effort, implementation management of IRWM grants and reporting? Please check the appropriate box.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Less than \$25,000	18%	4
\$25,000 to \$150,000	46%	10
\$150,000 to \$500,000	18%	4
Over \$500,000	18%	4
<i>answered question</i>		22
<i>skipped question</i>		6

37. Does your Region have Disadvantaged Community (DAC) areas as defined by the State?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	81%	21
No	19%	5
<i>answered question</i>		26
<i>skipped question</i>		2

38. How are you recognizing the special issues presented by DAC? (check all that apply):

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Prepared a needs assessment for our DACs	21%	3
Creating a DAC subcommittee to identify and contact possible DAC representatives	36%	5
Directly involved DAC representatives in our planning and plan update process (as RWMG members)	57%	8
Provide technical assistance to DACs to develop projects or to enhance readiness to proceed	50%	7
Create phased options for DAC projects to allow for assistance with design, engineering, environmental compliance and permitting	21%	3
Involved DACs in overall project ranking process	50%	7
Contacts with multiple leaders and groups for any single constituency	50%	7
Obtain DAC adoption/certification of our IRWMP	14%	2
Met with DAC representatives at their offices, homes or community facilities	50%	7
Use of alternative involvement modalities (location, time, place)	50%	7
Encouraged DAC groups to participate without requiring a financial contribution	71%	10
Provided stipends to support wider DAC participation	21%	3
Public outreach activities are multi-lingual	29%	4
Public outreach activities include PSAs on special interest/language radio stations	7%	1
Public outreach is culturally appropriate in content and methodology	21%	3
Other (please specify)		7
	<i>answered question</i>	14
	<i>skipped question</i>	14

Other Answers:

- 1) the whole area qualifies as a DAC
- 2) Address known needs of DAC in planning and implementation
- 3) We are not at this stage of decision making.
- 4) Tribal Consultation - MOU for communication and coordination
- 5) Prepared interest surveys to DAC targeted audience
- 6) coordinated DAC projects and needs through existing framework, Self-Help Enterprises

7) Project rating system gives priority to projects that serve DACs

39. Are representatives of DAC interests actively participating in your regional water management group?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	54%	14
No	46%	12
<i>answered question</i>		26
<i>skipped question</i>		2

40. Does your Plan address Environmental Justice issues?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	61%	14
No	39%	9
<i>answered question</i>		23
<i>skipped question</i>		5

41. Are Environmental Justice issues being handled separately from DAC issues?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	57%	12
No	43%	9
<i>answered question</i>		21
<i>skipped question</i>		7

42. Have liability issues (for the contracting entity) been a concern for your region?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	42%	10
No	58%	14
<i>answered question</i>		24
<i>skipped question</i>		4

43. **Would your region like further guidance from DWR on the type of data required to be collected as part of your IRWM planning efforts?**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	88%	22
No	12%	3
<i>answered question</i>		25
<i>skipped question</i>		3

44. **Do you think the Roundtable of Regions adds value in bringing statewide recognition for IRWM planning?**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	21
No	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		21
<i>skipped question</i>		7

45. **Any other comments you would like to make?**

- 1) Again, we are in the initial planning stages. We have received a grant from the Sierra Nevada Conservancy to formally launch IRWM planning with the goal of developing a Planning Grant Proposal by early 2009. I have left several question unanswered primarily because we are not at a point where I can provide such answers. Please feel free to contact me at your convenience.
- 2) Don't understand question 44. I see value in the Roundtable of Regions in developing understanding of different approaches and issues in different regions and advocating for state policy that is both effective and appropriately flexible in supporting the efforts of each region.
- 3) The Roundtable is a very helpful forum for sharing information and ideas!
- 4) At this time, the South Sierra IRWMP is in the pre-planning state. We have a grant from the Sierra Nevada Conservancy and the fiscal sponsor of that grant is the Sequoia Riverlands Trust. We are currently considering grant writers for our planning grant proposal and drafting and revising an MOU.
- 5) All of the water purveyors, all resource conservation districts, two agricultural entities and two environmental entities serve on the Flood Control District's Water Resource Advisory Committee. They advise the Board of the Flood Control District on IRWM issues and the Plan. IRWM Planning efforts are funded by the property taxes collected for the general budget of the Flood Control and Water

Conservation District. Implementation efforts are funded by the entity(ies) managing the project.

GREATER LOS ANGELES COUNTY INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN REPORT ON PLANNING NEEDS

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose

The purpose of this report is to describe potential planning needs that could inform a future update of the Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) plan for Greater Los Angeles County.

1.2 Background

The Integrated Regional Water Management Act of 2002 (SB 1672, Costa) amended the California Water Code (CWC) to add §10530 to encourage local agencies to work cooperatively to manage local and imported water supplies to improve the quality, quantity, and reliability of those supplies. While this act provided for IRWM plans and gave some guidance on the contents of a plan, the act gave little guidance or incentive for IRWM planning or plan implementation.

In November 2002, California voters passed Proposition 50, the *Water Security, Clean Drinking Water, Coastal and Beach Protection Act of 2002*, which provided \$500,000,000 (CWC §79560-79565) to fund competitive grants for projects consistent with an adopted IRWM plan. The grant program was run as a joint effort between the Department of Water Resources (DWR) and the State Water Quality Control Board to provide both planning and implementation grants to IRWM efforts. In accord with this Act, the Leadership Committee of the Greater Los Angeles County Region prepared an IRWMP, which was adopted on December 13, 2006.

In November 2006, California voters passed Proposition 84, the *Safe Drinking Water, Water Quality, and Supply, Flood Control, River and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2006* (Public Resources Code (PRC) §75001 – 75090) Proposition 84 provides \$1,000,000,000 (PRC §75026 (a)) for IRWM planning and implementation.

In October, 2008, the legislature approved SBX2 1, which includes the *Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Act* which clarifies the scope and content of IRWM plans and provided funding for both planning and implementation. SBX2 1 specifies that IRWM plans must include the following:

- (1) *Consideration of all of the resource management strategies identified in the California Water Plan, as updated by department Bulletin No. 160-2005 and future updates.*
- (2) *Consideration of objectives in the appropriate basin plan or plans and strategies to meet applicable water quality standards.*
- (3) *Description of the major water-related objectives and conflicts within a region.*
- (4) *Measurable regional objectives and criteria for developing regional project priorities.*
- (5) *An integrated, collaborative, multi-benefit approach to selection and design of projects and programs.*
- (6) *Identification and consideration of the water-related needs of disadvantaged communities in the area within the boundaries of the plan.*
- (7) *Performance measures and monitoring to demonstrate progress toward meeting regional objectives.*
- (8) *A plan for implementation and financing of identified projects and programs.*
- (9) *Consideration of greenhouse gas emissions of identified programs and projects.*

- (10) *Evaluation of the adaptability to climate change of water management systems in the region.*
- (11) *Documentation of data and technical analyses used in the development of the plan.*
- (12) *A process to disseminate data and information related to the development and implementation of the plan.*
- (13) *A process to coordinate water management projects and activities of participating local agencies and local stakeholders to avoid conflicts and take advantage of efficiencies.*
- (14) *Any other matters identified by the department [of water resources].*

2. POTENTIAL PLANNING NEEDS

2.1 Previously Identified Planning Needs

The Greater Los Angeles County Integrated Regional Water Management Plan, adopted December 13, 2006, identified a series of next steps and specific planning needs. The relevant section of the plan (Section 7.10) is attached as Appendix A of this report. The table of “Next Steps” (7-11) identifies various recommendations that would result in progress on plan elements. Some of these recommendations could require additional analysis and coordination, and could therefore be considered as planning needs.

The adopted plan also identifies three specific needs for additional planning, as described below.

2.1.1 Watershed Plans

Substantial portions of the Region are covered by existing or in-progress watershed plans. Preparation of additional watershed plans was suggested for those watersheds not currently covered by a plan, including: Burbank (east and west) Wash, Verdugo Wash, the mainstem of both the Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers (although the respective river Master Plans cover the river corridors and some adjacent lands), the Upper Los Angeles River (not covered by the Tujunga Plan and the Headwaters Plan), Los Cerritos Channel, and numerous smaller watersheds that drain directly to Santa Monica Bay and San Pedro Bay. For the watershed plans that have already been completed, implementation is the next step, along with assessment of the impacts and realized benefits. Regular updates of the plans should be undertaken to account for these assessments, as well as changes in local conditions and modifications to the IRWMP regional objectives.

2.1.2 Refinement of Planning Tools

Section 5 (Regional Project Concepts) of the Plan identifies three conceptual Regional Planning Tools (or approaches) which combine various project concepts to meet the established planning targets. Additional planning could refine the Regional Planning Tools into more specific solutions for each Subregion and thereby identify definitive projects which complement the stakeholder-identified projects, respond to local conditions and priorities, and fill the gap in benefits between those generated by the stakeholder-identified projects and the planning targets. As these projects are identified, they could be merged with, or where appropriate, replace some of the projects included in the project database to create a comprehensive project list which would achieve the objectives and planning targets.

2.1.3 Habitat Planning

Habitat issues have traditionally been addressed at different levels, with jurisdictions planning their own boundaries and resource management agencies planning at levels larger than the Region. Although some habitat planning is ongoing, much of this is limited to specific areas (e.g., coastal wetlands or the National Forest), and has yet to address the difficult questions of conservation and preservation of habitat around and within the urbanized portions of the Region. Although some long-term goals have been suggested (e.g., more naturalized stream channels), little work has been done to articulate the precise elements of that vision, or to

define incremental steps that would contribute to that long-term version. To ensure that habitat issues are addressed, the following steps could be taken:

- Develop a long term habitat/open space vision, with a clear scientific basis, and identify steps necessary to proceed with long-term regional planning;
- Define costs/benefits of, and establish targets for, achieving these goals;
- Identify additional studies to fill in gaps needed to complete the regional vision;
- Include assessment of on-going studies to help identify the goals (e.g., Green Visions Plan species mapping report);
- Define functional habitats; and
- Identify targets that help achieve the vision (e.g., removal of fish passage barriers).

2.2 Suggestions from Steering Committees

In recent months, the Steering Committees have considered the issue of planning needs and provided recommendations for additional planning needs that were not included in the adopted plan, or clarify some of the suggestions in the plan. Summaries of those discussions, which are listed below, are included in Appendix B to this report.

2.2.1 North Santa Monica Bay

- Integration of all of the planning needs from each of the existing plans
- BMP benefit analysis
- Trifuno District looking at potential regional cross county recycling programs
- Regional recycled water optimization plan
- Cross-county (LA and Ventura) water supply program
- Riparian protection plan
- Nutrient and salt management program development
- Groundwater water quality assessment
- Water use efficiency program
- Run-off capture and reuse program
- Integrated Water Supply Program, which would include:
 - Local capture of run-off for local reuse that will serve as both a water quality and conservation of supply benefit;
 - Cross-county recycled water use;
 - Regional banking and exchanges;
 - Develop local supply development options; and
 - Examination of the Malibu Creek Watershed Action Plan reviewed to identify additional planning needs

2.2.2 Upper Los Angeles Watersheds

- Public Information
 - Consider expanding activities to engage local planners to coordinate IRWMP planning goals with local plans. This could include meeting with city planners.
- Database Development and Management

- There is a clear need for a more robust and functional project database. Specific needs include development of additional data layers and tools to integrate projects. The database/GIS system should be available through the internet.
- Specific needed improvements include modifying the database such that the “generic search” printout displays project numbers, project title, sub-region, agency, contact last name, ready for bid, project number.
- The “ready for bid” field of the database should be modified to include “done” and “in process” and options on the drop-down menu.
- The database should be modified to include a “sub-watershed” field.
- The database does not currently require the user to input landowner. Knowledge of this information could be useful in some cases.
- Project proponents should be able to include linkages to their own projects in the database.
- Mapping
 - Additional mapping, including maps of sub-watersheds within each sub-region, would be beneficial for planning purposes.

2.2.3 Upper San Gabriel and Rio Hondo Watersheds

Immediate Term

- Improved coordination with related programs and planning efforts, which would include:
 - Invite planners from cities and Parks and Recreation staff to participate in the IRWMP process
 - Identify dates for other plans, including General Plans, recycled water system master plans, water quality improvement plans, and open space/habitat plans, and coordinate with these other planning efforts.
 - Improve coordination with two other programs: Statewide Watershed Program and Prop 84 Sustainable Cities Program.
- Refine the online project database to include a mechanism for tracking progress towards plan objectives.
- Improve stakeholder outreach in order to increase participation by local private conservancies, businesses, environmental organizations, agricultural entities, COGs, city managers, engineers, and planners, retail water purveyors, and DACs.

Near Term

- Institutionalize IRWMP goals and objectives into planning department policies throughout the Region. Revisit project integration in order to develop new or revised projects that maximize the achievement of multiple benefits.
- Improve the institutional structure of the IRWMP by forming an industrial advisory committee of businesses in the Region to provide input in the planning process. Determine a long-term structure for the IRWMP, such as a JPA for policy and project prioritization and a nonprofit foundation for fundraising that would allow the Region to apply for and receive tax-deductible contributions and provide grants for projects.
- Work with the State on legislation that would enable an overarching structure for integrated planning on the local level and require coordination between sustainable community plans and IRWMPs. Factor in State direction and mandates for GHG emission reductions into project planning.
- Survey of parks and open space in each sub-region and for characterization of the sub-regional water supply resources and gaps.

- Consider grant application writing opportunities to assist DACs. This region needs a better understanding of the needs of the DACs and how best to meet those needs through the IRWMP.

Long Term

- One or more legal entities should be considered as a structure for continuance of the IRWMP.
- Establishing a region-wide foundation for receiving and granting project funds.

2.2.4 Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles Watersheds

Coordination with Local Planning Efforts. Need to continue to identify general plans, master plans, water quality improvement plans, etc. Noted it was not necessary to know all plans, but to keep up-to-date and identify missing relevant plans. Look in the short term to identify local and regional plans that are easily coordinated. In the long term look to coordinating CIP plans from cities into the integration process. Also considered what it meant to coordinate plans, whether it was to just make the plans aware of each other or to bring the projects together; there may be a need to develop a matrix to coordinate the existing plans. There also is a need to make sure all the projects in the plans are entered into the database so a project matrix can be accurately developed.

Project Prioritization. Prop 84 project prioritization based on Prop 84 guidelines. The criteria for projects could be to rank the best projects for the region, then the best projects for Prop 84/1E funding. There also needs to be clarity on the separation of implementation and planning funding. Identify local sponsors not eligible for Prop 84 and identify potential integration opportunities.

Additional Planning. Need to focus on major issues that still need to be studied, specifically on fine tuning the plan, what we didn't study, and what do we have to fine tune.

Immediate Term Goals

- Identify other funding sources
- Update IRWMP (not just for Prop 84)
- Partner organization to get other funds (i.e. Annenberg Foundation or an "IRWMP Foundation") that is a private/non-profit to fundraise, establish financial security and fund more projects. Provide an institutional financing structure for long-term implementation.
- Project timelines / schedules
- Data management – analyze existing data
- Total monetary need for region
- Stakeholder outreach to business

2.2.5 South Bay Watersheds

- Water Supply
 - Water supply reliability needs and cost figures for entire South Bay sub-region outside what West Basin has for its service area
 - Water use efficiency program
 - Regional recycled water optimization
 - Model ordinance development for stormwater and gray water reuse - also conservation
- Water Quality
 - Better cost estimate for watershed water quality needs
 - Water quality data for effectiveness monitoring

- Model ordinance development for Low Impact Design (LID)
- Program on how to assist cities in meeting TMDL goal
- Habitat and Recreation Planning
 - Sediment Management Planning for regional water bodies
 - Identification of DAC recreation facilities that need greening improvements
- Flood Protection
 - Determine what will fix local flooding – if there is a common thread
 - Plan to identify replacing existing infrastructure for multiple benefit projects
- Integrated Planning Needs
 - Culling existing plans for needs
 - Integration of existing plans to identify needs for TMDL compliance
 - Scenario Development
- Other Planning Needs
 - Stakeholder Outreach
 - DAC Outreach
 - Implementation
 - IRWM Plan Update

2.3 Planning Needs from New IRWM Requirements

To be consistent with the provisions of SBX2 1, four specific topics will need to be addressed in a future update of the plan and therefore should be considered as future planning needs:

2.3.1 New Resource Management Strategies

The adopted plan was prepared using the list of strategies in Proposition 50, which are generally similar to the resource management strategies identified in the California Water Plan, including the in-progress Update 2009. However, the Pre-Admin Draft of Update 2009 includes several new strategies that would need to be included in the Greater LA Plan, and their applicability to the Greater LA Region described, including:

- Agricultural Lands Stewardship
- Agricultural Water Use Efficiency
- Economic Incentives
- Flood Impact Reduction
- Floodflow Management
- Forest Management
- Matching [Water] Quality to Use
- Precipitation Enhancement
- Salt Management
- System Reoperation

2.3.2 Basin Plan Water Quality Objectives

Although the adopted plan describes water quality concerns and acknowledges (then) current TMDLs, it does not specifically address the water quality objectives in the Basin Plan (prepared by the Los Angeles Regional

Water Quality Control Board). The various strategies to improve water quality currently identified in the plan are already intended to meet applicable water quality standards.

2.3.3 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The new plan standards require consideration of greenhouse gas emissions of identified programs and projects, although DWR has yet to identify what specifically would be required to address this topic.

2.3.4 Adaptability to Climate Change

The new plan standards require an evaluation of the adaptability of water management systems in the region to the affects of climate change. Although the specific affects of climate change that need to be considered are not specified, changes in the amount, timing, and intensity of precipitation, increases in the frequency and severity of droughts, and a rise in sea level are likely topics. Thus climate change could increase the variability of water supplies, both from local and distant sources, and increase the potential for flooding, both along existing channels and the coastline.

2.4 Other Possible Planning Needs

The Pre-Admin Draft of Update 2009 of the California Water Plan includes draft objectives for various water management initiatives and describes “related action” that are suggestions to implement the draft objectives. The text of Objective #1 (for IRWM planning) is included as Appendix C to this report. The related actions describe several potential planning needs, of which two are described below.

2.4.1 Integrated Flood Management

Integrated flood management is a new theme in Update 2009 of the California Water Plan and SBX2 1 acknowledges the need to improve the integration of flood protection into water resource management planning. The water plan describes integrated flood management as:

“...a process that promotes a comprehensive approach to flood management that considers land and water resources at a watershed scale within the context of Integrated Regional Water Management, which aims to maximize the benefits of floodplains and minimize the loss of life and damage to property from flooding.”

Although DWR has yet to identify specific standards for the improved integration of flood management into IRWM plans, it is anticipated that the pending release of Draft Guidelines for a planning grant will address this concept. DWR previously announced an intention to make planning funds available for the specific purpose of enhancing the flood management component of IRWM plans, but it is currently unclear whether it will make such funds available at this time.

2.4.2 Drought Contingency Planning

The related actions (for Objective #1 of the Water Plan) suggest that in the future, IWRM plans should include a drought contingency plan that: (1) describes how entities within a region can share supplies and infrastructure during droughts and emergencies, and (2) assumes a 20% increase in the frequency and duration of future dry conditions, until more accurate information is available.

3. NEXT STEPS

3.1 Identify High Priority Planning Needs

As noted above, SBX2 1 allocates funds for planning grants and DWR has indicated an intention to expedite the grant application process, although in signing the bill, the Governor noted that the funds won't be

available until March, 2009. In anticipation of the release of grant guidelines, it is suggested that the Leadership Committee identify the highest priorities for future planning needs, which could include:

- Planning Needs identified in the adopted plan:
 - Habitat Planning
 - Refinement of Planning Tools
- Suggestions from the Steering Committees. Although considerable variation has been identified by the Steering Committees, several common themes have emerged:
 - Refinement of Project Database
 - Enhanced coordination with local planning
 - Expanded outreach efforts
- New plan requirements per SBX2 1:
 - Add new Resource Management Strategies
 - Address the Water Quality Objectives in the Basin Plan
 - Consider Greenhouse Gas Emissions
 - Enhance the adaptability of IRMWP proposals to Climate Change
- Additional topics identified in Update 2009 of the California Water Plan;
 - Enhance Flood Management elements
 - Develop a drought contingency plan

The list of high-priority planning needs will be used to initiate development of a planning grant application, which will need to consider the (as-yet) unreleased planning grant guidelines. The consultant team will more fully develop a description of each potential planning need and estimate the costs for each effort. This information would inform development of a draft planning grant application, which would result in adoption of an updated plan.

APPENDIX A

IRWMP Plan Next Steps

Table 7-11 . Summary of Potential IRWMP Next Steps				
Implementation Element	Implementation Objectives	Suggested Implementation Phase		
		Immediate Term	Mid Term	Long Term
Coordination with Local Plans and Programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate a high degree of coordination with local planning efforts. • Be consistent with locally expressed goals. • Utilize the results of local planning where possible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify additional future planning efforts and when results are expected. • Determine dates for General Plan updates. • Increase interagency communication and coordination where plans, studies and implementation projects overlap jurisdictions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish coordination and communication procedures with ongoing local planning efforts. • Establish quantifiable Subregional goals/targets. • Create project "clearing house" to allow rapid identification of planned projects throughout the Region to avoid duplication and create opportunities for partnering. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrate IRWMP into General Plan and UWMP updates. • Update IRWMP with updated Subregional goals. • Consider ordinances that require water savings devices or penalize water waste generation. • Expand incentives for conservation. • Consider assessing fines for runoff and providing public recognition for water conservation. • Evaluate changing the Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CCR) in many homeowners associations that restrict the ability to utilize native or water friendly landscaping. • Reassess grey water reuse opportunities.
Institutional Structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achieve representation of all agencies and organizations necessary to ensure successful IRWMP execution. • Identify agency(ies) responsible for project implementation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree on structure and mechanism for future IRWMP governance. • Representation, roles and responsibilities. • Decision making procedure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Form JPAs where appropriate. • Form partnerships for combined development and implementation of projects with mutual benefits. • Examine current LC Structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilize adaptive management to determine appropriate institutional structures on a project or issue specific basis.

Table 7-11 . Summary of Potential IRWMP Next Steps				
Implementation Element	Implementation Objectives	Suggested Implementation Phase		
		Immediate Term	Mid Term	Long Term
Coordination with State and Federal Agencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achieve coordination with appropriate state and federal agencies. • Identify areas where state or federal agencies may be able to assist in communication or cooperation or funding. • Determine where state or federal agencies can assist in implementation of plan activities, components or processes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify further opportunities for coordination with state and federal agencies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop future projects with state and federal partners where mutually beneficial. • Pursue funding available through state and federal programs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine how state and federal agencies will influence long term project concepts. • Identify need for state or federal approval or assistance on existing projects.
Schedule	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine timelines for active or planned projects. • Ensure that IRWMP implementation schedule is coordinated with schedules for other water management activities in the Region and in the Subregions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify additional Regional or Subregional schedules or deadlines. • Determine periodic IRWMP “reopener” periods that will allow for comprehensive updates of stakeholders, projects and implementation plans. • Establish Subregional funding priorities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Select projects that will help meet upcoming regulatory deadlines. • Select projects that are ready to proceed and are high priority. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine the optimal combination of projects to meet long range deadlines. • Monitor/update project schedules and continue to identify needs and opportunities.
Financing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify funding for plan implementation. • Determine opportunities for ongoing financing for O&M and maintenance of projects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide information on local potential funding measures (fees, assessments etc.). • Compile list of current grants being pursued. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop detailed estimates of capital and O&M costs for existing projects. • Track all potential funding opportunities. • Develop innovative, multi-benefit projects to maximize opportunities for competitive funding. • Pursue special earmarks for specific projects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine the most cost effective combination of projects that can achieve Subregional objectives.

Table 7-11 . Summary of Potential IRWMP Next Steps				
Implementation Element	Implementation Objectives	Suggested Implementation Phase		
		Immediate Term	Mid Term	Long Term
Data Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify methods for efficient collection and dissemination of data. • Identify data gaps. • Determine how data collection will support statewide data needs. • Identify obstacles to sharing data between agencies and determine methods to remove them. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document known gaps in data. • Identify data overlaps. • Suggest opportunities for improved data sets. • Develop a data management collection and dissemination system for the Subregion. • Identify lead entity or entities to collect and manage data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilize data to guide development of existing and future projects. • Develop project monitoring plans that can also fill data gaps, if possible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify long term trends for the Region and Subregion • Maintain data and continue to collect information.
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine the appropriate measures to monitor for Regional and Subregional performance. • Provide mechanisms for adapting project operation in response to performance data. • Discuss results in an integrated fashion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine what performance measures are important for targets. • Determine what performance measures are appropriate for existing projects. • Identify potential project modifications in response to collected data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measure performance of all benefits of multi-objective projects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop Regional and Subregional monitoring system. • Identify opportunities for coordinated Subregional responses to performance data.
Stakeholder Outreach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain contact and increase coordination with current participants. • Expand participation and increase project submission all cities and unincorporated areas. • Increase participation of Disadvantaged Communities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue outreach to all identified stakeholders on plan finalization and adoption. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create compelling case statement of benefits of participating in ongoing IRWMP process. • Continue outreach and briefings to key stakeholders that are not participating. • Intensify outreach to Councils of Government, watershed stakeholder groups, and other groups involved in area planning efforts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to address barriers to participation including lack of resources; lack of information on how to engage, and language barriers.

APPENDIX B

Planning Needs Identified by Steering Committees

Memorandum



Greater Los Angeles County IRWMP

Subject: Planning Needs for North Santa Monica Bay and South Bay (Revised)
Prepared For: Mark Horne, PBS&J
Prepared by: Persephene St. Charles, RMC Water and Environment
Date: October 9, 2008

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide a listing of planning needs developed to date based on Steering Committee discussions held with the North Santa Monica Bay and South Bay sub-regions in August and September 2008 as well as any additional comments received by South Bay Steering Committee attendees at their October 7, 2008 meeting.

4. SOUTH BAY SUB-REGION

The South Bay Steering Committee discussed the following regarding planning needs at the September 9, 2008 meeting:

- The goals in the IRWMP should be looked at to determine what has been accomplished and see how much work each sub-region needs in each area.
- Projects in the IRWMP database should be examined to determine whether they will bring the sub-region towards its goals.
- Planning documents relevant to the sub-region should be looked at to find goals which have not been met. The lead entity of each planning document should be contacted for current needs. Examples of these documents include:
 - City of Los Angeles IRP & Water Quality Compliance Master Plan
 - LA Water Quality Compliance Master Plan
 - Santa Monica Bay Restoration Commission Plan Update
 - Dominguez Watershed Master Plan
 - Ballona Creek Master Plan

Potential planning needs include for the South Bay Sub-region include:

Planning Need	IRWM Plan Update Solution
<u>Water Supply</u>	
Water supply reliability needs and cost figures for entire South Bay sub-region outside what West Basin has for its service area	Develop subregional Water Supply targets and roll up to revise regional target
Water use efficiency program	Develop Regional WUE Program
Regional recycled water optimization	Develop Regional RW Water Supply and Demand Database

Planning Need	IRWM Plan Update Solution
Model ordinance development for stormwater and gray water reuse - also conservation	Will aid cities in meeting targets outlined in plan
<u>Water Quality</u>	
Better cost estimate for watershed water quality needs	Develop cost estimating process for watershed water quality programs – compare green solutions to estimates
Water quality data for effectiveness monitoring	Regional water quality monitoring program
Model ordinance development for Low Impact Design (LID)	Helping agencies with planning to meet targets as opposed to implementation
Program on how to assist cities in meeting TMDL goal	Helping to find ways to meet targets and supplement project database
<u>Habitat and Recreation Planning</u>	
Sediment Management Planning for regional water bodies	Determine where projects are needed to meet targets
Identification of DAC recreation facilities that need greening improvements	RW facilities plan for DAC recreation areas
<u>Flood Protection</u>	
Determine what will fix local flooding – if there is a common thread	DAC and Local agency flood planning program to identify flood control objectives for plan
Plan to identify replacing existing infrastructure for multiple benefit projects	Will allow integrated solutions to flood control to be identified
<u>Integrated Planning Needs</u>	
Culling existing plans for needs	Develop and maintain an inventory and database of existing plan and needs
Integration of existing plans to identify needs for TMDL compliance	Develop sub-committee to look at database to determine potential planning integration opportunities
Scenario Development	Develop regional reliability plan based on climate and socioeconomic potentials
<u>Other Planning Needs</u>	
Stakeholder Outreach	Keep plan updated and progress monitored by continuing regular SC and LC meetings
DAC Outreach	Implement year 2 of DAC outreach plan
Implementation	Create and maintain database that quantifies accomplishments under each target
IRWM Plan Update	5 year cycle with interim annual updates

5. NORTH SANTA MONICA BAY SUB-REGION

The North Santa Monica Bay Steering Committee discussed the following planning needs at the September 16, 2008 meeting:

- Integration of all of the planning needs from each of the existing plans
- BMP benefit analysis
- Trifuno District looking at potential regional cross county recycling programs
- Regional recycled water optimization plan
- Cross-county (LA and Ventura) water supply program
- Riparian protection plan
- Nutrient and salt management program development
- Groundwater water quality assessment
- Water use efficiency program
- Run-off capture and reuse program
- The group then discussed how many of the planning needs above are interrelated and proposed the need for a larger umbrella planning program that could be called “Integrated Water Supply Program” - the main tenant being to offset imported supplies and increase water quality through better utilization of local resources. Elements of this program would involve the following:
 - Local capture of run-off for local reuse that will serve as both a water quality and conservation of supply benefit
 - Cross-county recycled water use
 - Regional banking and exchanges
 - Develop local supply development options
 - Examination of the Malibu Creek Watershed Action Plan reviewed to identify additional planning needs



Date: October 6, 2008
To: Mark Horne
Copy:
From: Ed Means
Re: Upper Los Angeles River Steering Committee Planning Needs

The Upper Los Angeles River Steering Committee (SC) has identified the following planning needs for possible inclusion in a planning grant application:

Public Information

The ULARA Steering Committee has identified a near term planning grant need associated with public information. Under a public information planning grant, the Region would consider expanding activities to engage local planners to coordinate IRWMP planning goals with local plans. This could include meeting with city planners.

Database development and management

- There is a clear need for a more robust and functional project database. Specific needs include development of additional data layers and tools to integrate projects. The database/GIS system should be available through the internet.
- Specific needed improvements include modifying the database such that the “generic search” printout displays project numbers, project title, sub-region, agency, contact last name, ready for bid, project number.
- The “ready for bid” field of the database should be modified to include “done” and “in process” and options on the drop-down menu.
- The database should be modified to include a “sub-watershed” field.
- The database does not currently require the user to input landowner. Knowledge of this information could be useful in some cases.
- Project proponents should be able to include linkages to their own projects in the database.

Mapping

The Steering Committee concluded that additional mapping, including maps of sub-watersheds within each sub-region, would be beneficial for planning purposes.



Date: October 6, 2008
To: Mark Horne
Copy:
From: Ed Means
Re: Upper San Gabriel River and Rio Hondo Steering Committee Planning Needs

The USGR&RH Steering Committee (SC) has identified the following planning needs for possible inclusion in a planning grant application:

Immediate Term

In the immediate term, the SC would like improved coordination with related programs and planning efforts. Specific activities that were identified to achieve this goal include:

- Invite planners from cities and Parks and Recreation staff to participate in the IRWMP process
- Identify dates for other plans, including General Plans, recycled water system master plans, water quality improvement plans, and open space/habitat plans, and coordinate with these other planning efforts.
- Improve coordination with two other programs: Statewide Watershed Program and Prop 84 Sustainable Cities Program.

The SC would also like the online project database to be refined to include a mechanism for tracking progress towards plan objectives.

Additionally, the SC would like to improve stakeholder outreach in order to increase participation by local private conservancies, businesses, environmental organizations, agricultural entities, COGs, city managers/engineers/planners, retail water purveyors, and DACs.

Near Term

In the near term, the SC would like IRWMP goals and objectives to be institutionalized into planning department policies throughout the Region. The SC would also like to revisit project integration in order to develop new or revised projects that maximize the achievement of multiple benefits.

The SC would like to improve the institutional structure of the IRWMP by forming an industrial advisory committee of businesses in the Region to provide input in the planning process. The SC would also like to determine a long-term structure for the IRWMP, such as a JPA for policy and

project prioritization and a nonprofit foundation for fundraising that would allow the Region to apply for and receive tax-deductible contributions and provide grants for projects.

The SC would like to work with the State on legislation that would enable an overarching structure for integrated planning on the local level and require coordination between sustainable community plans and IRWMPs. The SC would also like to factor State direction and mandates for GHG emission reductions into project planning.

The SC also sees a near-term need for a survey of parks and open space in each sub-region and for characterization of the sub-regional water supply resources and gaps.

For DACs, the SC would like to consider grant application writing opportunities to assist DACs. This region needs a better understanding of the needs of the DACs and how best to meet those needs through the IRWMP.

Long Term

The SC would like one or more legal entities considered as a structure for continuance of the IRWMP. The SC also envisions establishing a region-wide foundation for receiving and granting project funds.

Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers Steering Committee Planning Grant Needs

Coordination with Local Planning Efforts

Need to continue to identify general plans, master plans, water quality improvement plans, etc. Noted it was not necessary to know all plans, but to keep up-to-date and identify missing relevant plans. Look in the short term to identify local and regional plans that are easily coordinated. In the long term look to coordinating CIP plans from cities into the integration process. Also considered what it meant to coordinate plans, whether it was to just make the plans aware of each other or to bring the projects together; there may be a need to develop a matrix to coordinate the existing plans. There also is a need to make sure all the projects in the plans are entered into the database so a project matrix can be accurately developed.

Project Prioritization

Prop 84 project prioritization based on Prop 84 guidelines. The criteria for projects could be to rank the best projects for the region, then the best projects for Prop 84/1E funding. There also needs to be clarity on the separation of implementation and planning funding. Identify local sponsors not eligible for Prop 84 and identify potential integration opportunities.

Additional Planning

Need to focus on major issues that still need to be studied, specifically on fine tuning the plan, what we didn't study, and what do we have to fine tune.

Immediate Term Goals

- Identify other funding sources
- Update IRWMP (not just for Prop 84)
- Partner organization to get other funds (i.e. Annenberg Foundation or an "IRWMP Foundation") that is a private/non-profit to fundraise, establish financial security and fund more projects. Provide an institutional financing structure for long-term implementation.
- Project timelines / schedules
- Data management – analyze existing data
- Total monetary need for region
- Stakeholder outreach to business

APPENDIX C

California Water Plan Update 2009
Volume 1 Strategic Plan

Pre-Administrative Draft

Ch 7 Implementation Plan

Objective 1 - Promote, improve, and expand Integrated Regional Water Management to build regional partnerships that have a central role in California water resources planning, sustainable watershed and floodplain management, and increasing regional self-sufficiency.

Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) planning offers a framework for water managers to address the myriad water-related challenges and provide for future needs. Over the past decade, California has improved its understanding of the value of regional planning and made significant steps in implementing IRWM. IRWM is a portfolio approach for determining the appropriate mix of water demand and supply management options and water quality actions. The goal is to provide long-term, reliable water supplies for all users at lowest reasonable cost and with highest possible benefits for economic development, environmental quality, and other societal objectives. Moreover, if appropriately developed and implemented, IRWM plans—in combination with other regional and watershed planning efforts for land use and transportation—can serve as the basis for broader community and regional plans for adapting to climate change impacts and increasing regional self-sufficiency.

California lies within multiple climate zones, therefore each region of the state will experience unique impacts from climate change. For some regions, improving watershed health will be the chief concern. Other areas will be affected by saltwater intrusion. In particular, regions that depend heavily upon water imports will need strategies to cope with greater uncertainty in supply. Because economic and environmental effects depend on location, adaptation strategies need to be regionally appropriate and preferably at a watershed scale.

Related Actions:

1. State government should encourage—through both financial and technical assistance—IRWM planning and implementation throughout California with greater emphasis on adapting to a changing climate and drought and flood contingency planning.
 - State government should promote and provide incentives to regional partnerships to move towards water and flood planning at a watershed-scale and to prepare their IRWM plans using watershed and groundwater basin boundaries.
 - State government should closely coordinate the IRWM Program and State Watershed Program to prevent duplication, leverage resources, and provide clear and consistent guidance to stakeholders.
2. IRWM plans must include strategies for meeting the following objectives and issues and the plan elements listed in the box below:
 - Protection and improvement of water supply reliability, including identification of feasible agricultural and urban water use efficiency strategies.
 - Identification and consideration of the drinking water quality of communities within the area of the plan.
 - Protection and improvement of water quality within the area of the plan, consistent with the relevant basin plan.
 - Identification of significant threats to groundwater resources and feasible strategies to avoid and reverse overdrafting.
 - Protection, restoration, and improvement of stewardship of aquatic, riparian, and watershed resources within the region.

- Protection of groundwater resources from contamination.
 - Identification and consideration of the water-related needs of disadvantaged communities in the area within the boundaries of the plan.
 - Description of major water-related goals, objectives, challenges, and conflicts in a region.
 - Measurable regional objectives and criteria for developing regional project priorities.
 - Consideration of objectives in the appropriate basin plan or plans and strategies to meet applicable water quality standards.
 - Evaluation of vulnerability and adaptability of water management systems in the region to climate change.
 - A *facilitation plan* describing an integrated, collaborative, multi-benefit approach and public process for the identification, selection, and design of projects and programs.
 - Consideration of all resource management strategies identified in the California Water Plan, as described in Update 2005 (Bulletin 160-2005) and future updates.
 - Consideration of greenhouse gas emissions of identified programs and projects.
 - A *communication plan* with strategies to disseminate data and information about the development and implementation of the plan.
 - An *implementation and financing plan* for identified projects and programs including a process to coordinate water management projects and activities of participating local agencies and local stakeholders to avoid conflicts and take advantage of efficiencies.
 - A *monitoring plan* with performance measures to demonstrate progress toward meeting regional objectives.
 - Publicly-accessible documentation of data, methods, and technical analyses used in developing the IRWM plan.
3. By 2011, all IRWM plans should include the following elements to help the region adapt to a changing climate:
- An assessment of the region's vulnerability to the long-term increased risk and uncertainty associated with climate change.
 - Strategies for substantial water conservation and higher use efficiency (see Objective 2).
 - Conjunctive water management strategies (see Objective 3)
 - An *integrated flood management plan* (see Objective 6).
 - A *drought contingency plan* that: (1) describes how entities within a region can share supplies and infrastructure during droughts and emergencies, and (2) assumes a 20% increase in the frequency and duration of future dry conditions, until more accurate information is available (see Objective 8).
 - Strategies for improving coordination with land use policies and planning that:
 - Help restore natural processes in watersheds to increase infiltration, slow runoff, improve water quality, and augment the natural storage of water (see Objectives 5);
 - Encourage Low Impact Development that reduces water demand and increases water supply reliability (see Objective 2).

Note: the complete document is available at:

[http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/docs/cwpu2009/0908pre-admin/vol1/1-7_Implement_PreAdmin_\(09-13-08\)%20CLEAN.doc](http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/docs/cwpu2009/0908pre-admin/vol1/1-7_Implement_PreAdmin_(09-13-08)%20CLEAN.doc)

2008 IRWMP Water Supply Gap Analysis

Approach

To project the Greater Los Angeles County Region's (GLACO) water supply gap in 2030, the following steps were undertaken:

1. Determine GLACO's portion of the Metropolitan Water District's (MWD) Integrated Water Resources Plan (IRP) targets for each supply type based on GLACO's percentage of the MWD's demands.
2. Determine the Region's current supplies by supply type under six supply scenarios.
3. For each scenario, calculate the gap between GLACO's supply targets and current local and imported supplies.

Definition of Terms

Consistent with MWD's IRP, the terms "target" and "gap" are defined as follows for this memo:

A *target* is the amount of water from a given supply category that MWD intends to develop to meet its projected demands. The total supply target, which is the sum of the supply targets from each category, is equal to amount of water needed to meet projected demands in a given year.

A *gap* is defined as the difference between the amount of water currently available in a supply category and the target for that supply category. The difference between the sum of all current supplies and the total supply target is equal to the total supply gap.

1) GLACO's Portion of MWD's IRP Supply Targets

To determine GLACO's portion of the IRP targets, 2008 retail demand data from MWD's Shortage Allocation Plan (SAP) process was used¹. 2008 retail and replenishment demands for each MWD member agency serving LA County, 2008 retail and replenishment demands for nineteen percent² of MWDOC, and 2004-2006 average annual groundwater extractions from the cities of Alhambra, Azusa, Monterey Park, and Sierra Madre and were combined to determine GLACO's total 2008 retail demand. The portion of GLACO's 2008 retail and replenishment demand to MWD's total 2008 retail and replenishment demand was then determined, as shown in the following table.

Table 1: GLACO's Portion of Total Regional Demands

Los Angeles County Retail Demands	1,714,000
San Gabriel Valley MWD Retail Demands	48,000
Los Angeles County Replenishment Demands	101,000
<i>Los Angeles County Subtotal</i>	<i>1,863,000</i>
MWDOC Retail Demands	503,000
MWDOC Replenishment Demands	52,000
% of MWDOC population in GLACO	19%
<i>MWDOC Subtotal</i>	<i>105,000</i>
Total GLACO Demands	1,968,000
Total MWD Retail Demands	3,915,000
San Gabriel Valley MWD Demands	48,000
Total MWD Replenishment Demands	214,000
Total Regional Demands	4,177,000
GLACO portion of Regional Total	47%

¹ The Shortage Allocation Plan (SAP) data was used because it (1) is the most recent source of publicly available retail demand data and (2) was reviewed by each of MWD's member agencies during the development of the SAP.

² 19% was used based on information from MWDOC during the 2005 assessment that 19% of its demands should be included in GLACO.

The Region's percentage of MWD's total demand, calculated above to be 47%, was then multiplied by the total MWD supply targets reported in the 2007 IRP Implementation Report³ to determine what portion of these targets should be attributed to GLACO. The results are shown in the table below:

Table 2: GLACO's Portion of MWD's IRP Supply Targets

	2007 IRP Implementation Report Supply Targets				GLACO's Portion of IRP Targets ⁴			
	2010 ⁵	2015 ⁶	2020 ⁷	2025 ⁸	2010	2015	2020	2025
In-Basin Groundwater Storage	275,000	288,000	300,000	300,000	129,000	135,000	141,000	141,000
SWP	463,000	560,000	650,000*	650,000*	218,000	263,000	306,000	306,000
CRA	879,000	1,065,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	413,000	501,000	588,000	588,000
CV Storage and Transfers	550,000	550,000	550,000	550,000	259,000	259,000	259,000	259,000
In-Basin Surface Water Storage	620,000	620,000	620,000	620,000	291,000	291,000	291,000	291,000
Conservation	865,000	950,000	1,028,000	1,107,000	407,000	447,000	483,000	520,000
Local Resources (LRP)**	660,000	705,000	750,000	750,000	310,000	331,000	353,000	353,000
<i>Recycling</i>	<i>408,000</i>	<i>436,000</i>	<i>464,000</i>	<i>464,000</i>	<i>192,000</i>	<i>205,000</i>	<i>218,000</i>	<i>218,000</i>
<i>Groundwater Recovery</i>	<i>99,000</i>	<i>105,000</i>	<i>112,000</i>	<i>112,000</i>	<i>46,000</i>	<i>49,000</i>	<i>53,000</i>	<i>53,000</i>
<i>Seawater Desalination</i>	<i>153,000</i>	<i>164,000</i>	<i>174,000</i>	<i>174,000</i>	<i>72,000</i>	<i>77,000</i>	<i>82,000</i>	<i>82,000</i>
Local Production***	1,810,000 ⁹	1,860,000	1,910,000 ¹⁰	1,920,000 ¹¹	851,000	874,000	898,000	902,000
Total Supply Target	6,122,000	6,598,000	7,058,000	7,147,000	2,878,000	3,101,000	3,319,000	3,360,000

* The SWP 2020 and 2025 supply targets do not consider any improvements to the Delta.

** Percentages for recycling, groundwater recovery, and seawater desalination are based on LRP targets from the 2003 IRP Update for each resource type. Current LRP target does not differentiate between resource types.

***The IRP does not include targets for local production, but does include estimates used in the analysis to help formulate other resource targets. The estimates from the 2003 IRP Update have been used for this analysis as these have not been modified.

³ IRP targets were obtained from the 2005 and 2007 IRP Implementation Report. Buffers were included where applicable.

⁴ Equal to 47% of the 2007 IRP Implementation Report Supply Targets

⁵ Source: 2007 IRP Implementation Report, p. 1-4, unless otherwise noted.

⁶ 2015 numbers are straight-lined between 2010 and 2020.

⁷ Source: 2005 IRP Implementation Report, p. 4, unless otherwise noted.

⁸ Source: 2005 IRP Implementation Report, p. 4, unless otherwise noted.

⁹ Source: 2003 IRP Update Report, p. 63 (Table 5-2)

¹⁰ Source: 2003 IRP Update Report, p. 63 (Table 5-2)

¹¹ Source: 2003 IRP Update Report, p. 63 (Table 5-2)

2) Region's Current Supplies

The Region's current supplies are divided into two categories: MWD imported water and local supply. MWD imported supplies include in-basin groundwater storage, the State Water Project, the Colorado River Aqueduct, Central Valley storage and transfers, and in-basin surface water storage. Local supplies include conservation, local resources, and local production.

Supply conditions were assessed under the six scenarios. For each scenario, SWP supplies were estimated using DWR's recently updated SWP reliability curve¹². Supply projections from this document include the projected effects of the Wanger decision, which include a decrease in SWP Table A deliveries, particularly during multiple dry years, and a lower probability of annual Table A delivery exceeding 1.7 MAF¹³. All other supplies were held constant for each scenario. Scenarios 4 through 6 are based on the average of the four climate change scenarios included in The State Water Project Delivery Report 2007. The scenarios considered were:

1. Worst year (1977) - 6% SWP allocation¹⁴
2. Worst 3-year (1990-92) - 18% SWP allocation¹⁵
3. Normal year (Average 1922 – 1983) - 63% SWP allocation¹⁶
4. Worst year incorporating climate change - 7% SWP allocation¹⁷
5. Worst 3-year incorporating climate change - 18% SWP allocation¹⁸
6. Normal year incorporating climate change - 67% SWP allocation¹⁹

For all MWD imported supplies, GLACO's portion of current MWD supplies from each source was calculated using the region's portion of MWD total demand, determined above. Current MWD supplies for each source were obtained from the 2007 IRP Implementation Report²⁰.

Tables 3 and 4 show GLACO's current portion SWP supplies for each scenario and GLACO's current portion of MWD's other imported supplies²¹.

Table 3: GLACO's Current Portion of MWD's SWP Supplies by Scenario

Condition	Allocation %	MWD Allocation ²²	GLACO's Current Supply
Worst Year	6%	121,000	57,000
Worst 3-Year	18%	362,000	170,000
Average Year	63%	1,267,000	595,000
Worst Year w/ Climate Change	7%	141,000	66,000
Worst 3-Year w/ Climate Change	18%	362,000	170,000
Average Year w/ Climate Change	67%	1,348,000	634,000

¹² The State Water Project Delivery Reliability Report 2007

¹³ The State Water Project Delivery Reliability Report 2007, p. 31

¹⁴ The State Water Project Delivery Reliability Report 2007, p. 44

¹⁵ The State Water Project Delivery Reliability Report 2007, p. 80

¹⁶ The State Water Project Delivery Reliability Report 2007, p. 44

¹⁷ The State Water Project Delivery Reliability Report 2007, p. 78

¹⁸ Average of 4 scenarios in The State Water Project Delivery Reliability Report 2008, p 78

¹⁹ The State Water Project Delivery Reliability Report 2007, p. 78

²⁰ Page 1-4 of the 2007 IRP Implementation Report, October 2007

²¹ GLACO's portion of MWD's imported supplies was assumed to be 47%, based on the calculations in Table 1.

²² Amounts assume MWD will "call back" 100,000 AF of SWP Table A supplies per MWD's 2003 agreement to transfer SWP entitlement to Desert Water Agency and Coachella Valley Water District; therefore, the maximum MWD allocation of 2,011,500 AFY was used to compute MWD allocations in six different conditions.

Table 4: GLACO's Current Portion of MWD's Other Imported Supplies

MWD Imported Water Source	MWD Current Supply	GLACO Current Supply
In-Basin Groundwater Storage	133,000	63,000
CRA	666,000	313,000
CV Storage and Transfers*	292,000	137,000
In-Basin Surface Water Storage	940,000	442,000

Local supplies were obtained from the following sources:

Conservation- The Region's supplies from conservation were assumed to be the same as in the 2005 IRWMP water supply numbers. These numbers were obtained from Table A.1-12 of MWD's 2005 Regional Urban Water Management Plan (RUWMP). The conservation supplies of 407,000 AF include:

- All LA County conservation (268,000 AF)
- 20% of Orange County conservation (18,000 AF)²³
- 45%²⁴ of pre-1990 conservation of 250,000 acre-feet²⁵ for LA County (113,000 AF), and
- 3%²⁶ of pre-1990 conservation of 250,000 acre-feet for Orange County (8,000 AF).

*Local Resources (LRP)*²⁷ - Supplies from Metropolitan's Local Resources Program include recycled water, groundwater recovery, and seawater desalination. Average supplies from these sources from 2004 to 2006, obtained from the SAP, were assumed to be the current supply.

*Local Production*²⁸ - Supplies from local production, including groundwater, surface water, and Los Angeles Aqueduct, were assumed to be the average supply from 2004 to 2006 for these sources, as obtained from the SAP.

Table 5 shows GLACO's current local supplies.

Table 5: GLACO's Current Local Supplies

Local Supply Source	GLACO Current Supply
Conservation	407,000
Local Resources (LRP)	113,000
<i>Recycling</i>	<i>73,000</i>
<i>Groundwater Recovery</i>	<i>37,000</i>
<i>Seawater Desalination/Other</i>	<i>3,000</i>
Local Production	939,000

²³ Based on the information provided by MWDOC that the GLACO portion of MWDOC represents about 20% of MWDOC demand

²⁴ 45% was used because LA County's retail demand in 1990 was 45% of MWD's total retail demand (from Table A.1-5 of MWD's 2005 RUWMP, p. A.1-10)

²⁵ Source: Table A.1-12 of MWD's 2005 RUWMP, p. A.1-14.

²⁶ 3% was used because it is 20% (GLACO's portion) of Orange County's portion (17%) of MWD's total 1990 retail demand (from Table A.1-5 of MWD's 2005 RUWMP, p. A.1-10).

²⁷ Source: "Base Year Data" tab of MWD's 2008 Supply Allocation 1-10-08 workbook, Tables: Groundwater Recovery, Other, Recycling

²⁸ Source: "Base Year Data" tab of MWD's 2008 Supply Allocation 1-10-08 workbook, Tables: Groundwater, Los Angeles Aqueduct, and Surface Production.

The region’s total current supplies for each of the six scenarios were calculated by adding together each of the local and imported supplies identified above. The results are presented in Table 6 below:

Table 6: GLACO’s Total Current Supply by Scenario

Scenario	Current Supply ²⁹
Worst Year	2,471,000
Worst 3-Year	2,584,000
Normal Year	3,009,000
Worst Year Incorporating Climate Change	2,480,000
Worst 3-Year Incorporating Climate Change	2,584,000
Normal Year Incorporating Climate Change	3,048,000

3) Gap between Supply Target and Current Supplies

To determine the supply gap, GLACO’s supply targets for each five-year increment were compared to the current supply under each scenario. For each scenario, GLACO’s total current supplies (Table 6) were subtracted from GLACO’s total supply target for each year (Table 2) to calculate the gap between supply targets and current supplies. Numbers were straight-lined from 2020 through 2025 to project the supply gap in 2030. The gaps between supply targets and current supplies for each scenario are shown in Table 7.

Table 7: Gaps between GLACO Supply Targets and Current Supplies

Conditions	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030 ³⁰
2005 IRWMP	150,000	430,000	760,000	800,000	N/A
Worst Year	407,000	630,000	848,000	889,000	930,000
Worst 3-Year	294,000	517,000	735,000	776,000	817,000
Normal Year	-131,000	92,000	310,000	351,000	392,000
Worst Year w/ Climate Change	398,000	621,000	839,000	880,000	921,000
Worst 3-Year w/ Climate Change	294,000	517,000	735,000	776,000	817,000
Normal Year w/ Climate Change	-170,000	53,000	271,000	312,000	353,000

Results

The results of the analysis for each scenario are as follows:

Worst Year- The worst year scenario is based on a 6% SWP allocation, which is identified as the worst case possibility (1977 conditions) in the State Water Project Delivery Reliability Report 2007. This scenario results in the largest gap between current supplies and 2030 supply targets, totaling approximately 930,000 AF.

Worst 3-Year- This scenario is based on 1990-1992 conditions, with an 18% SWP allocation. Under this scenario, the projected gap between current supplies and 2030 supply targets is approximately 817,000 AF.

²⁹ Numbers are rounded.

³⁰ As the 2007 IRP does not include supply targets for 2030, the supply gap for 2030 was calculated by straightlining the gap from 2020 to 2025.

Normal Year- This scenario is based on the long-term average SWP delivery of 63%. Under normal conditions, the estimated supply gap in 2030 is 392,000 AF.

Worst Year w/ Climate Change- In the State Water Project Delivery Reliability Report 2007, climate change was incorporated into reliability projections for 2027 using two climate change models: the Geophysical Fluid Dynamic Model and the Parallel Climate Model. Under both models, a 2027 SWP single dry year allocation was projected to be 7%. The estimated 2030 supply gap under this scenario is 921,000 AF.

Worst 3-Year w/ Climate Change- Based on the climate change models identified above, a 2027 SWP allocation under 1990-1992 conditions is projected to be 18%. Under this scenario, the projected gap between current supplies and 2030 supply targets is approximately 817,000 AF.

Normal Year w/ Climate Change- Based on the climate change models identified above, the 2027 long-term average SWP allocation is projected to be 67%. Under this scenario, the projected gap between current supplies and 2030 supply targets is approximately 353,000 AF.

Based on this assessment, GLACO will need to aggressively pursue additional supplies in order to fill the gap between current supplies and 2030 supply targets.

Other Factors to Consider

Local impacts- This analysis does not consider local impacts under each supply scenario, but local supplies could also be affected. For instance, if climate change affects supplies from the SWP, it could potentially affect local groundwater and surface water production as well.

Demand projections- As an alternative to the supply projections in the IRP, the demand projections in the RUWMP could be used to calculate the supply gap. It was decided by the water managers in the Region that the IRP targets provide a more accurate picture of future demands than the RUWMP demands; therefore, the IRP targets have been used to calculate the Region's supply gap. The calculations of the supply gap using the RUWMP demand projections are provided in Appendix A.

Breakdown of supply targets- The IRP targets include a breakdown of what portion of the gap will be filled by what sources. In the initial water supply analysis, it was decided that this breakdown should not be included in the IRWMP. For the IRWMP update, the Region will need to decide whether this breakdown should be included in the IRWMP update, or, alternately, whether a breakdown of supplies to be developed by MWD and those to be developed by the Region should be included.

Supply gap to be included in IRWMP update- Under the different scenarios analyzed, the supply gap varies by more than 500,000 AF. The Region will need to decide on which scenario to use for determining the supply gap to include in the IRWMP. Factors to consider when making this determination include the amount of supplies to be filled by storage and transfers in the worst case scenarios as well as the cost-effectiveness of new supply development.

Conservation targets- If AB 2175 is finalized, the conservation targets will need to be reevaluated in order to make sure the requirements of the bill are captured in the planning numbers.

Appendix A

Supply Gap Using RUWMP Demands Projections

To calculate the Region's total raw demand using RUWMP demand projections, the following data was added together:

- Total retail demand from RUWMP Table A.1-5 for all of LA County and 19% of Orange County
- Conservation savings from RUWMP Table A.1-12 for all of LA County and 19% of Orange County
- The Region's portion of MWD pre-1990 conservation of 250,000. This was calculated by multiplying 250,000 AF by the Region's portion of MWD 1990 demands³¹.

Table A.1: Regions' Demands from RUWMP

Normal Year Demands					
	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025
LA County Demand with Conservation	1,777,000	1,886,000	1,917,000	1,977,000	2,023,000
Conservation	268,000	330,000	369,000	400,000	437,000
LA County Raw Demands	2,045,000	2,216,000	2,287,000	2,377,000	2,460,000
Orange County Demand with Conservation	673,000	714,000	722,000	735,000	749,000
MWDOC Segment Demands with Conservation	128,000	136,000	137,000	140,000	142,000
Orange County Conservation	90,000	110,000	120,000	126,000	135,000
Proportion of Conservation	17,000	21,000	23,000	24,000	26,000
MWDOC Segment Raw Demands	145,000	156,000	160,000	164,000	168,000
Regions Demands with Conservation	1,905,000	2,022,000	2,055,000	2,117,000	2,166,000
Region's Conservation	285,000	351,000	392,000	424,000	462,000
Proportion of Pre-1990 Conservation of 250,000 AF	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000
Total Raw Demands for Region	2,310,000	2,492,000	2,566,000	2,661,000	2,748,000

³¹ Based on RUWMP Table A.1-5, LA County demands represented 45% of total MWD demands in 1990. 19% of Orange County demands represented 3% of total 1990 MWD demands.

These demand projections are lower than the supply targets provided in the IRP in part because the IRP numbers (1) include a supply buffer of 500,000 AF to hedge against evolving resource implementation risks and supply/demand uncertainty and (2) are based on dry year demands, which are significantly higher than the average year demands provided at the county level in the RUWMP.

The Region's current supplies from Table 6 were then subtracted from the total raw demands for the Region in Table A.1 to determine the gap. The gap was straight-lined from 2020 through 2025 to project the supply gap in 2030. The results are presented in Table A.2.

Table A.2: Gaps between RUWMP Average Year Demand Projections and Current Supplies

Scenario	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030 (est.)
Worst Year	21,000	95,000	190,000	277,000	364,000
Worst 3-Year	-92,000	-18,000	77,000	164,000	251,000
Normal Year	-517,000	-443,000	-348,000	-261,000	-174,000
Worst Year w/ Climate Change	12,000	86,000	181,000	268,000	355,000
Worst 3-Year w/ Climate Change	-92,000	-18,000	77,000	164,000	251,000
Normal Year w/ Climate Change	-556,000	-482,000	-387,000	-300,000	-213,000

Glossary of Terms

CRA- Colorado River Aqueduct

CV- Central Valley

GLACO- Greater Los Angeles County Region

IRP- Integrated Resources Plan

IRWMP- Integrated Regional Water Management Plan

LRP- Local Resources Program

MWD- Metropolitan Water District

MWDOC- Municipal Water District of Orange County

RUWMP- Regional Urban Water Management Plan

SAP- Shortage Allocation Plan

SWP- State Water Project

INTERIM OUTREACH PLAN TARGETING DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES IN THE GREATER LOS ANGELES REGION

Prepared for
Greater Los Angeles County Integrated Regional Water Management Plan
May 29, 2008
Revised September 15, 2008

BROWN AND CALDWELL

801 South Figueroa Street, Suite 950, Los Angeles, CA 90017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
Outreach to Disadvantaged Communities in the Greater Los Angeles Region.....	1
Defining “Disadvantaged Communities”	2
Ongoing Work of Ad Hoc Committee	2
Responsibility of Implementing Outreach to Disadvantaged Communities	3
1. GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND STRATEGIES IN OUTREACH TO DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES	1-1
Goals:.....	1-1
Objectives:.....	1-1
Strategies to Achieve the Objectives of Outreach to Disadvantaged Communities:	1-1
2. TARGET AUDIENCES IN AND REPRESENTING DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES	2-1
3. OUTREACH PLANNING AND TRAINING	3-1
Objectives.....	3-1
Strategies	3-1
Outreach Activities	3-2
Training.....	3-2
Planning Outreach; Selecting DAC Projects for Outreach and Technical Support	3-2
How to Measure the Effectiveness of this Element of the Outreach Plan	3-4
4. COORDINATION WITH LOCAL AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS IN ADVANCE OF OUTREACH TO DACS.....	4-1
Objectives.....	4-1
Strategies	4-1
Outreach Activities	4-2
How to Measure the Effectiveness of this Element of the Outreach Plan	4-3
5. GRASS ROOTS OUTREACH.....	5-1
Objectives.....	5-1
Strategies	5-1
Outreach Activities	5-2
Update and expand the stakeholder database.....	5-3
How to Measure the Effectiveness of this Element of the Outreach Plan	5-4
6. MEDIA RELATIONS AND PUBLIC INFORMATION ABOUT IRWMP DAC-RELATED EFFORTS AND OPPORTUNITIES.....	6-1
Objectives.....	6-1
Strategies	6-1
Outreach Activities	6-1
How to Measure the Effectiveness of this Element of the Outreach Plan	6-3

INTERIM OUTREACH PLAN TARGETING DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES IN THE GREATER LOS ANGELES REGION

INTRODUCTION

The Greater Los Angeles Region Integrated Resources Water Management Plan (IRWMP) is a visionary plan that integrates water supply, water quality, and open space management strategies; and maximizes the utilization of local water resources for an area 2,058 square-miles in size with a population of over 10 million people. The mission of the Greater Los Angeles Region IRWMP is to address the water resource needs of the Region in an integrated and collaborative manner. Stakeholder involvement in the IRWMP process has been crucial in establishing the vision for and carrying out the integrated plan.

The IRWMP organizational structure is a Leadership Committee and five Subregional Steering Committees. The Leadership Committee is an 11-member group includes the Los Angeles County Flood Control District, representatives of each Subregional Steering Committee and five stakeholder agencies.

The five Subregional Steering Committees are made up of agencies, cities, stakeholder representatives, and other representatives for the watersheds. These committees meet monthly and, among many other responsibilities, they have primary responsibility for conducting outreach to communities within their respective watersheds.

Greater Los Angeles Region IRWMP Subregions:

- Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers Watersheds
- North Santa Monica Bay Watersheds
- South Bay Watersheds
- Upper Los Angeles River Watershed
- Upper San Gabriel River and Rio Hondo Watersheds

Outreach to Disadvantaged Communities in the Greater Los Angeles Region

IRWMP Leadership and Steering Committees have identified outreach to disadvantaged communities (DACs) as one of its highest priorities. Meaningful public participation goals, objectives, and strategies are critical to involving DACs in the process of recommending and pursuing projects and programs in their communities. This outreach plan was prepared to help coordinate and guide the outreach activities led by the five Subregional Steering Committees to reach and involve DACs in their communities, about water resource issues that are important to them.

Extensive comments were made on the May 2008 Draft Outreach Plan Targeting Disadvantaged Communities in the Greater Los Angeles Region. Most comments received have been incorporated into this September 2008 Interim Outreach Plan; and the resultant document has not only been edited and expanded, but it has also been re-structured.

Defining “Disadvantaged Communities”

For the purposes of this outreach plan, the accepted definition of Disadvantaged Communities will concur with the State of California’s current definition:

Any community where the median household income (MHI) is below 80% of the statewide household income (SMHI).

Further, a DAC project is any project that meets the targeted benefits designed to meet the particular needs of one or more DACs and agreed upon by members of the DAC(s). For example, a Subregional Steering Committee may identify and outreach to one or more DACs outside of the subregion’s boundaries, as long as the DAC-project(s) developed is based on benefits to those communities and the environment.

This outreach plan is “Interim” in part to allow time for further discussion of how the IRWMP will define DACs in the future. Other factors that were suggested to be considered for refining the definition include:

- Income analysis by census block
- Areas adjacent to DACs
- Below 80% of MHI in Los Angeles
- Per capita income analysis
- Average of Mother’s highest level of education
- Percentage of homeless population
- Percentage of children on a free lunch program
- Lowest achieving schools
- Proximity to polluting industries, air quality, and health indicators

Ongoing Work of Ad Hoc Committee

An ad hoc committee of IRWMP participants who have worked closely with many of Los Angeles’ disadvantaged communities formed to provide additional comments on the outreach plan. The ad hoc committee will continue to meet and discuss major policy issues as indicated in the box that follows.

An ad hoc committee of IRWMP participants convened for the purposes of providing comments to the draft plan and adding more substance in several areas. The group settled on three main tasks that will be undertaken to strengthen and facilitate implementation of this Interim Plan. After the ad hoc committee completes its work, its recommendations will be offered for consideration as amendments or supplements to the Interim Plan.

Tasks the ad hoc committee has taken on include:

1. Write language to articulate the overarching mission and purpose for this outreach. Essentially, the group would pose and answer the question: “Why do this outreach in the first place?”
2. Consider alternative methods for defining and identifying DACs. While acknowledging the criterion of <80% of the State Median Household Income set forth in law, the ad hoc committee may suggest other methods as supplementary or as cross-check to the utility of MHI criterion.
3. Create and implement a spreadsheet or Web form to generate an initial outreach list from all IRWMP participants. Data captured will include all basic contact information for individual leaders, their organizational affiliation, and information on the primary focus of the organizations with relevance to IRWMP.

Responsibility of Implementing Outreach to Disadvantaged Communities

This Interim Plan reflects that the Subregional Steering Committees have the primary responsibility of outreach to stakeholders within watersheds of the Greater Los Angeles Region. At present, consultants are under contract to provide a limited amount of support to each Subregional Steering Committee: to organize one workshop and provide technical assistance for up to two DAC projects per watershed.

DAC outreach will be conducted in a phased manner, increasing and broadening over time. Some of the outreach activities identified in this Interim Plan will have to wait until additional resources are acquired.

The amount of time and effort to implement the entire plan are significant. For resource planning purposes only, the total level of effort equates to a minimum of one and up to three full-time dedicated outreach staff. This depends greatly upon the complexity and volume of outreach undertaken at any time and the in-kind resources that may be available. Certain important outreach services are specialized: translation, website programming, and technical support. Most of the activities described in this outreach plan can be readily implemented by those who have experience in working with disadvantaged communities and who have a familiarity with the IRWMP.

INTERIM OUTREACH PLAN TARGETING DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES IN THE GREATER LOS ANGELES REGION

1. GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND STRATEGIES IN OUTREACH TO DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES

Goals:

- Identify and address the water-related needs of disadvantaged communities in the Greater Los Angeles region.
- Reach and involve DACs in the IRWMP process and in identifying and developing projects and programs that benefit their communities.

Objectives:

- Use a phased approach to implement the outreach plan; gradually reaching more people living and working in the region's disadvantaged communities with water resource issues to address.
- In the near-term, given the current resources of the IRWMP, work with disadvantaged communities to develop projects from the current IRWMP projects list. This includes providing technical support and helping DACs identify leads, funding sources, and other resources.
- Over time, work with identified disadvantaged communities and their representatives to develop a comprehensive analysis of the water-related needs of these communities throughout the region.
- Also over time, as additional resources are available to the IRWMP, work with disadvantaged communities to develop a suite of projects to address the identified needs and include them in the IRWMP.

Strategies to Achieve the Objectives of Outreach to Disadvantaged Communities:

- Involve DAC representatives in IRWMP project identification, development, and implementation.
- Build a comprehensive database of disadvantaged communities and community representatives in each subregion and use this to target outreach to neighborhoods in order to increase the number of representatives and residents of DACs who are participating in the IRWMP process and in each subregions IRWMP Steering Committee meetings.
- Inform representatives and residents of DACs about opportunities to be involved with their IRWMP subregional planning activities.
- Inform DACs about realistic benefits and opportunities for their communities through IRWMP collaboration and through partnerships with agencies and organizations.
- Conduct outreach in disadvantaged communities to gather information on community needs.
- Conduct outreach to assist DACs in developing existing projects by providing in-kind planning, design, environmental, and engineering assistance – and where needed, add new projects to the IRWMP projects list.

INTERIM OUTREACH PLAN TARGETING DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES IN THE GREATER LOS ANGELES REGION

2. TARGET AUDIENCES IN AND REPRESENTING DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES

- Cities and agencies that represent disadvantaged communities with proposed DAC-projects, especially smaller cities and agencies that may not have resources to pursue those projects without support.
- Residents of disadvantaged communities with proposed DAC-projects.
- Residents of disadvantaged communities that do not currently have DAC-project(s) identified in the IRWMP list of projects.
- Major houses of worship serving disadvantaged communities, some of which may have already organized committees around environmental and social justice issues.
- Parent-Teacher Associations and Principals of large high schools in disadvantaged communities.
- Economic-development agencies or organizations representing areas encompassing disadvantaged communities (e.g., FAME Renaissance, Figueroa Corridor Partners).
- Chambers of Commerce and Business Improvement Districts representing areas encompassing disadvantaged communities.
- Health providers – major hospitals and clinics – serving disadvantaged communities.
- Neighborhood Councils and Neighborhood Watch groups with DACs in their jurisdictions.
- Community-based and environmental organizations that have relationships with DACs.
- Councils of Governments.
- Organizations that represent disadvantaged communities in the Greater Los Angeles Region.

INTERIM OUTREACH PLAN TARGETING DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES IN THE GREATER LOS ANGELES REGION

3. OUTREACH PLANNING AND TRAINING

The IRWMP Steering Committees have the primary responsibility of implementing outreach to disadvantaged communities. At the present time, the work of outreach will likely be shared among Steering Committee members so many people will have a role in outreach to potentially thousands of people in diverse communities throughout the Greater Los Angeles Region.

Outreach planning and training are recommended to help Steering Committee members plan, coordinate, and prepare to successfully communicate with DAC target audiences.

Objectives

- Develop a unified message and coordinated approach for the outreach program, building upon the relationships and efforts of Steering Committee representatives already involved in the IRWMP and DACs.
- Identify DAC-projects for each subregion to focus outreach to DACs, ultimately to develop with DACs and submit proposals for grant funding.
- Help Steering Committees have a better understanding of environmental justice issues and working with disadvantaged communities.
- Build on existing relationships.
- Identify potential collaborators; reduce fragmentation of outreach efforts.

Strategies

- Organize at least one DAC-outreach planning workshop for each Steering Committee, annually.
- Because time and resources are limited and the Greater Los Angeles Region is so vast, much of the 2008/2009 outreach will be focused on a manageable number of projects within each subregion. Projects prioritized for DAC outreach in 2008/2009 should be reasonably conceptualized and preferably already have DACs involved in or aware of the IRWMP process.
- Consultant support is available to each Steering Committee to develop two DAC projects per subregion for grant funding submittals. This, however, doesn't limit Steering Committees to targeting only two disadvantaged communities or developing more than two DAC-projects.
- Over the longer term, new projects may be added to the IRWMP projects list and pursued in partnership with DACs. Over time, Steering Committees will create a region-wide needs assessment to determine where communities with greatest needs are, and to help focus DAC outreach efforts.
- At present, there are no disadvantaged communities identified in the North Santa Monica Bay (NSMB) Subregion. At its DAC-outreach planning workshop(s), the NSMB Steering Committee will identify:
 - potential DAC-projects to be implemented within the subregion that will benefit DACs outside of the subregion
 - a means of justifying and confirming the connection between those potential projects in the subregion and target DACs

- partnering opportunities

Outreach Activities

- In the first year, each Steering Committee will organize at least one DAC-outreach planning workshop; more may be needed to consider all of the planning and coordination needed to implement outreach. In the DAC-outreach planning workshops, Steering Committees will make a number of decisions, identified below, about how and where to focus efforts and resources. Recommended activities include:

Training

- It is recommended that each Steering Committee educate themselves about environmental justice and disadvantaged communities. One way to accomplish this is to invite a social/environmental justice organization with experience in working closely with Los Angeles area DACs to give a presentation to Steering Committee members and share experiences and case studies.

Planning Outreach; Selecting DAC Projects for Outreach and Technical Support

- Each Steering Committee will begin by locating where DACs are within each sub-region using the IRWMP maps of the watersheds. Assess current projects in the IRWMP project database that fall within DACs in the respective sub-region to determine what additional information and resources are needed to elevate those projects to viable proposals that can be submitted for funding.
- Since several DAC-projects could be viable, the Steering Committee will narrow down the list and determine which ones they will pursue this year. The assessment described immediately above will help Steering Committees make DAC/project selections based upon criteria they agree upon (e.g. communities with greatest needs, water resources issues that can be addressed, where there are existing relationships with DACs, etc.).
- The NSMB Subregion will identify which projects within the subregion would have clear benefits to DACs located in other subregions. (Example: Projects that would improve water quality at Surfrider or other public beaches would serve DAC recreational opportunities.) The NSMB Steering Committee will have to also determine methods of correlating the projects to identify and target DACs. (One example given was to survey riders of the National Park Services beach bus to NSMB public beaches to determine which communities are coming from outside of the sub-region to enjoy the beaches and who would benefit from IRWMP improvements.)
- Each Steering Committee will identify the water resource problems in DACs that are expected to be addressed by implementing the proposed DAC projects. This may need to be explored in more detail and confirmed through the technical support provided by consultants and others as projects are developed, but the problems that may be solved should be at least preliminarily identified up-front.
- For those DAC projects identified in the step above, the Steering Committee should also identify entities in the subregion that are familiar with the target communities. These may be:
 - representatives of local governments: such as field deputies of City Council offices, and/or community outreach coordinators for cities or other agencies
 - members of the Steering Committees or participating in the IRWMP in some way
 - non-government organizations (NGOs)
 - a person or group referred by local governments
 - or may already be leading outreach to the target DACs.

- Determine whether those entities could help perform outreach, provide in-kind services, potentially serve as leads for DAC projects, and/or provide other partnership support.
- The NSMB Steering Committee will have to first identify the disadvantaged communities outside of their sub-region that will be targeted for DAC outreach and DAC project development. Once the target DACs are identified, the Steering Committee would then identify entities that have existing relationships with the target DACs and who may also be familiar with IRWMP processes. While other Subregional Steering Committees have the benefit of at least having the target DACs within their watersheds, the NSMB Steering Committee may not have existing relationships with DACs outside of the watershed. If that is the case, the Steering Committee is urged to meet with the local agencies of the target DACs (e.g., the field offices of Los Angeles City Council districts; City Managers or Administrators; See Section 2 for more information on coordinating with local agencies and organizations.) The local agencies should be willing to participate with the NSMB and/or refer to others who would be able to help build ties between the Steering Committee and the target DACs.

NOTE: The ad hoc committee of IRWMP participants will undertake the creation of a spreadsheet or Web form to generate an initial outreach list from all IRWMP participants. Data captured will include all basic contact information for individual leaders, their organizational affiliation, and information on the primary focus of the organizations with relevance to IRWMP. Each Subregional Steering Committee is encouraged to consult this list to identify entities in their watershed that are familiar with the target communities.

- Identify what others are doing in the targeted disadvantaged communities to (a) determine potential collaborators and (b) avoid duplicating outreach efforts.
 - Each Steering Committee will also identify agencies (local, regional, other) that can potentially partner with the DACs to provide other resources, additional technical assistance, and help the communities with project implementation.
 - Coordinate messages and responsibilities for outreach activities targeting DACs in each subregion. When considering which Steering Committee members will take on responsibilities for implementing outreach activities, experience in working with DACs in the Greater Los Angeles Region, familiarity with targeted communities and their local governments, and familiarity with the IRWMP process all help make the outreach process more streamlined and successful.
- In subsequent years, Steering Committees will:
 - Assess resources available for outreach, determine a reasonable number of DAC projects to pursue, and establish criteria for the types of DAC projects the Steering Committee would like to focus on.
 - Criteria for prioritizing the types of DAC projects and which communities are selected should be developed with full buy-in from the Steering Committee. Examples of criteria include location within the subregion, degree of community need, the potential for benefits to DACs and water quality within the subregion, potential partners available, and other considerations.
 - Determine which of the planning and training activities above (completed in the first year) were most successful, which should be modified to work better, or eliminated as an outreach strategy. Incorporate lessons learned and implement the planning and training activities.
 - Steering Committees should be open to identifying new DAC projects, developed in partnership with DACs.
 - Recommended for further study:
 - Determine appropriate region-wide needs assessment tools that would enable each Subregional Steering Committee to determine the communities with greatest needs, and to help focus DAC outreach efforts. All the Steering Committees and/or the Leadership Committee should agree upon the needs assessment tools.

How to Measure the Effectiveness of this Element of the Outreach Plan

1. Did the Steering Committees arrange for a presentation about environmental justice and working with DACs?
2. Did the Steering Committees identify DACs and/or DAC-projects for outreach?
3. Did the Steering Committees also identify the water resource issues that DAC projects could address?
4. Were people and/or organizations who are familiar with the target DACs identified?
5. Did the Steering Committees look into whether or not others in the region are working on similar efforts or with the same DACs, and if so, did they identify whether or not there are opportunities for collaboration and/or partnerships?
6. Were other potential partners considered?
7. Did the Steering Committees discuss the key messages for their DAC outreach and did they identify which members of the committees would take specific responsibilities?

Responsible Party	Necessary Resources
Each Steering Committee	IRWMP watershed maps showing location of DACs IRWMP projects database IRWMP stakeholder database For specialized training: experts in environmental justice, with experience working with DACs

INTERIM OUTREACH PLAN TARGETING DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES IN THE GREATER LOS ANGELES REGION

4. COORDINATION WITH LOCAL AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS IN ADVANCE OF OUTREACH TO DACS

Local agencies and organizations are critically important partners in outreach to targeted disadvantaged communities. They have local knowledge, existing relationships, and an awareness of key issues and concerns. Some will already be familiar with the IRWMP. The IRWMP Steering Committees will coordinate with local agencies and organizations in advance of outreach to DACs to gain awareness and sensitivity to community-specific issues. Each community is unique, and by coordinating with local agencies and organizations, the Steering Committees implementing outreach to DACs should have better communications to the targeted groups, stronger relationships with local partners, and more effective outreach from the start.

Local agencies and organizations may be understaffed, so Steering Committee members are encouraged to go to these local entities. They may not have time or people to participate in IRWMP outreach to their DACs, but it is imperative to extend the invitation, and to provide timely information about outreach results to the local agencies and organizations if they cannot participate.

Objectives

- Inform and involve local agencies and organizations in the IRWMP process, coordinating closely with them in advance of and throughout outreach to DACs who are their constituents.
- Learn from local agencies and organizations; they will have valuable insights that will help facilitate successful outreach to the Region's DACs and successful DAC-project development.
- Build on existing relationships between local agencies/organizations and DACs to increase DAC participation in identifying and developing projects.

Strategies

- Meet with representatives of local agencies and organizations to identify key leaders of targeted disadvantaged communities and appropriate means of communicating with them.
- Also jointly identify other entities that have good, existing relationships with targeted disadvantaged communities that could be involved in facilitating successful communications with the DACs.
- Coordinate with representatives of local agencies and organizations to jointly conduct interviews with key constituent leaders of disadvantaged communities and explore appropriate means of communicating with larger numbers of the targeted DACs.
- Encourage local agencies/organizations and DAC leaders to participate in and/or become members of Steering Committees.
- Coordinate with local agencies/organizations to identify resources, opportunities, and other non-IRWMP activities that could benefit the target DACs in their efforts to identify, develop, and implement DAC projects.
- Coordinate with local agencies/organizations to identify potential leads for DAC projects.
- Update and expand the existing stakeholder database with current contact information for local agencies and organizations in disadvantaged communities.

Outreach Activities

- Each Steering Committee will identify and meet one-on-one with local agencies and organizations with whom members of the committee have existing relationships.
 - Suggestions for representatives of local agencies and organizations include:
 - Elected officials including City Council field offices, other local government/agency representatives (City Managers or City Administrators’ offices may refer to key knowledgeable staff)
 - School principals and/or ministers working in disadvantaged communities
 - Local DAC-focused NGOs
 - Executive directors of local Chambers of Commerce; and
 - others as identified in the target audiences list.
 - Meet with as many people as needed to help begin to understand local issues and to be introduced to local DAC-community leaders.
 - Discussions will focus on IRWMP issues, with emphasis on facilitating and coordinating local DAC participation and projects. A “highlights” pamphlet has been developed to help keep the focus on IRWMP.
 - When meeting with local agencies organizations, Steering Committee members and local representatives will not only discuss opportunities, but also reasonable expectations and possible other (non-IRWMP) partners that could also participate in helping DACs develop projects for their communities.
- To be accomplished during these one-on-one meetings:
 - Strengthen existing relationships between Steering Committees and local agencies/organizations to cooperatively work towards DAC-participation in IRWMP.
 - Ask local agency/organizations for the names and contact information of grass-roots level leaders of DACs (e.g., major churches serving DACs; major schools to be contacted in DACs; major health providers and clinics serving DACs; active business organizations/Chambers of Commerce; and others with strong ties to DACs and their interests).
 - Ask local agency/organization representatives for their insights regarding how to best outreach to constituents; where needs are greatest; where opportunities for collaboration on projects may exist; for suggestions of potential leads for DAC projects; where there may be one or more grant funding opportunities that may become more successful with IRWMP support; and to help identify needs in DACs where future projects may be identified and pursued through the IRWMP process.
 - Ask local agency/organization for their insights on languages spoken and read by the target DACs, and for suggestions of existing publications that would be most appropriate for DAC-communications (e.g., church bulletins; local weekly papers; school bulletins; other).
 - Ask local agency/organization about any other similar efforts to address water quality, water supply, and/or open space issues in the targeted DACs. Ask for an introduction to the proponents of those efforts to meet and discuss common ground.
 - Identify “next steps” of working together towards increasing DAC-participation in the IRWMP process.
 - Ask local agency/organizations to join Steering Committee members in outreach to their DAC constituents. Inform them of relevant outreach goals and timelines, and discuss reasonable expectations.

- Personally invite representatives of local agencies and organizations to participate in – or co-sponsor -- IRWMP workshops for DACs and other DAC-outreach. Workshops and community meetings that are sponsored or co-sponsored by local agencies and organizations are likely to be better attended and received by DACs.
- Personally invite local agency/organization representatives to join as members and/or participate regularly in Steering Committee meetings. They may not have time to participate, but the invitation should be extended and remain open. If they cannot participate, let them know where to find information (e.g., website.)

How to Measure the Effectiveness of this Element of the Outreach Plan

1. Did representatives of the Steering Committees identify and meet with representatives of local government and/or local organizations representing the targeted DACs?
2. Did they develop a preliminary understanding of water- and community-issues facing the target DACs; a preliminary understanding of communications methods that are appropriate for the targeted DACs; including the languages spoken and read in the communities, and any publications that the DACs may receive at home or work, houses of workshop, from their children’s schools, or other means?
3. Were representatives of Steering Committees introduced to (or at least informed of) leaders of disadvantaged communities?
4. Do the Steering Committees have an increased understanding of how best to outreach to members of disadvantaged communities, based upon credible, local experience of the representatives that met with Steering Committee representatives?
5. Did any potential local partners agree to co-sponsor and/or assist in outreach to target DACs?
6. Did representatives of Steering Committees invite the people they met (local governments and/or organizations) to participate in IRWMP Steering Committee meetings and/or let them know the invitation to participate is always open?

Responsible Party	Necessary Resources
Steering Committee Members	Time to meet individually with representatives of local agencies and organizations IRWMP Highlights pamphlet, IRWMP projects list, and subregional watershed maps showing DACs

INTERIM OUTREACH PLAN TARGETING DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES IN THE GREATER LOS ANGELES REGION

5. GRASS ROOTS OUTREACH

For DAC projects to be successful, they need the cooperation, knowledge, and commitment of the people who live and work in the targeted communities. Using primarily grass roots outreach, the IRWMP Sub-regional Steering Committees will provide opportunities for target DACs to become informed and involved as equal partners in projects that would benefit their communities. Public participation with DACs needs to be inclusive and democratic, and to allow time for thorough communication of issues, potential solutions, potential impacts and benefits, responsibilities, and partnerships.

DACs will be encouraged and helped to understand, review and modify projects that have been already identified through IRWMP processes to-date to meet their communities' needs for water supply, water quality, and open space. DACs will also have opportunities to propose and explore new projects that would address these needs.

While people who live and work in DACs will be invited to participate in ongoing IRWMP Steering Committees, the vast majority of the meetings and other interaction with DACs will take place in the targeted communities. By implementing the coordination with local agencies and organizations described in the previous section, those leading grass roots outreach to DACs should already be aware of the languages spoken by targeted DAC members, who many of the local community leaders are, most of the optimal methods of communications, and current important issues.

If at all possible, outreach to DACs should be led by people or entities that have existing relationships with the targeted communities and an understanding of the IRWMP processes.

Objectives

- Involve disadvantaged communities in developing projects – and where needed, adding new projects to the IRWMP projects list that will serve DACs to address water resource needs.
- Learn from DACs; their local knowledge and commitment are essential for successful DAC-project development.
- Improve the chances of DAC-projects being approved for grant funding and implementation.

Strategies

- Build upon existing relationships.
- Support existing outreach to DAC-projects.
- Where there is no known existing outreach to support, build upon relationships of local agencies and organizations, and use local groups to help with outreach implementation.
- Hold community meetings and other grass roots interaction in the communities of potential DAC-projects.
- Organize enough grass roots public participation and allow ample time and opportunities for DACs to become informed, involved, and committed to the success of projects that will benefit their communities.
- Update and expand the IRWMP database of stakeholders.

Outreach Activities

- The preferred situation would be for the IRWMP Steering Committees to coordinate with existing, successful DAC-outreach efforts, as identified in the subregional DAC-outreach planning workshops described earlier (Section 1). Wherever possible, build on these existing relationships.
 - The existing outreach efforts should have processes in place that are working well, so the DAC-project discussions would become an additional topic in an ongoing program. The Steering Committee would provide the support needed to help this occur without excessive burden to the ongoing program.
 - Support may be in the form of funding, sharing outreach responsibilities, attending and staffing meetings with DACs, developing presentations, organizing tours related to potential DAC-projects, and/or providing resources ranging from bringing easels to providing technical assistance. The support would be provided by in-kind services offered by Steering Committee members, and to the degree possible through the IRWMP consultant contract, consultants (technical and outreach) will provide services to augment the existing outreach.
- Where there are no known existing outreach efforts for the project(s) or DACs selected by the Steering Committee, the Steering Committee will identify a task leader to organize grass roots outreach to involve DACs in proposed project needs assessment, planning, development, and grant applications. Other members of the Steering Committee will assist and, to the degree possible through the IRWMP consultant contract, consultants (technical and outreach) will provide services to augment this outreach.
 - In collaboration with local agencies / organizations, a series of community meetings will be organized in the immediate vicinity of the project proposed for each target DAC.
 - Work with community members, non-profit and/or other community-based organizations or other locally-respected groups to conduct door-to-door outreach to residents and businesses in DACs to invite residents and businesses to attend community and/or house meetings.
 - Likewise, work with these entities to conduct other grass roots outreach – like providing information through schools (e.g. PTAs) and senior centers, phone trees, church bulletins. Coordinate outreach with other DAC-representatives, such as local houses of worship, health institutions, ESL programs, job training centers, and others. Local agencies and organizations will help the outreach task leader learn which methods of communication work best in the specific and unique communities. While suggestions of different outreach opportunities are offered here, Steering Committees and their outreach leaders are encouraged to maintain flexibility to conduct the types of outreach that will best reach residents and effectively provide meaningful public participation opportunities that will be culturally-appropriate to the community.
 - Neighborhood-level discussions will focus on the proposed project and details that reflect questions, water issues, water management needs, and local benefits to the DAC.
 - With participation of each DAC, assess not only their water management problems, but also how those water resource issues get addressed: through education? ... through engineering and capital improvements? ... through a combination of behavior changes and structural solutions?
 - The agendas and documentation of each community meeting will include a discussion of community's needs, priorities, and points of agreement and disagreement indicated by participating representatives of DACs.
 - Information should be made readily available to DACs.
 - The ease of the target DACs getting information about public participation opportunities and/or projects being discussed with them is critical for successful outreach.

- Information should be culturally appropriate, sensitive to the languages read/spoken in the community, and not so technical as to be confusing or difficult to understand.
- Distribution should not be confined to a small, immediate area but made widely throughout the community. Wide distribution encourages inclusiveness and democracy within the DACs.
- Distribution should also be done in ample time before meetings; late notification works against good community outreach.
- Use plain language and avoid jargon. Explain technical terms. Use commonly understood pictures or graphics to illustrate more complex concepts.
- Provide translators for community members who do not speak English to participate. It is reasonable to ask those community members to let meeting organizers know 48 hours in advance that translation may be needed. It is also good to be prepared regardless of advance notification in communities where English is clearly the second language.
- Explain relevant IRWMP processes so that the “procedure” does not overwhelm the goal of good communication.
- Listen and learn from the audience.
- Provide technical support to DACs to develop projects for grant funding applications
 - Technical support will be needed to develop projects for grant funding, implementation, and maintenance. Consultants to the IRWMP will provide technical support for two projects per subregion in the first year of this outreach program. DACs and Steering Committees, through outreach and coordination with local agencies and organizations, will arrange for additional technical support needed to carry the DAC-projects to fruition.
 - Technical support to DACs will include:
 - One-on-one support with selected DAC groups to provide technical assistance such that more complete information on each project can be provided to the IRWMP database. Steering committees in each sub-region will be responsible for identifying up to two projects in each sub-region that meet the recommended guidelines and approving them to receive one-on-one support. One-on-one engagement will take place immediately before or after the scheduled Steering Committee meetings or subregional workshops.
 - Providing information to project proponents necessary to update the project information in the IRWMP database
 - An implementation plan for each project that outlines the steps needed in order for the project to be implemented. The implementation plan for each project is expected to be used to clarify the project's readiness to proceed and in potential grant applications.
 - Support will be limited to 20 hours per project or 40 hours per sub-region.
 - No translation services will be provided.

Update and expand the stakeholder database.

- Add all contact information gathered through one-on-one interviews, community meetings and other outreach.
- Review current databases of other programs with stakeholders in common with IRWMP and add potentially interested parties.
- Add all certified Los Angeles Neighborhood Councils and Neighborhood Watches countywide.

- Update the database regularly to include organizations involved in emerging social and environmental justice programs in the region.
- New contact information should be provided to Steering Committee representatives to update subregional sections of the stakeholder database.

How to Measure the Effectiveness of this Element of the Outreach Plan

1. Was a leader for the DAC-outreach identified for each targeted DAC?
2. Did the outreach involve residents, businesses, leaders and representatives of disadvantaged communities -- working with IRWMP Steering Committees to assess local needs, and to develop, prioritize, and support projects for implementation?
3. Were meetings, workshops, or events well attended, and did members of DACs begin to understand, get involved, and commit to the success of project(s) to benefit their community(s)?
4. Were meetings, workshops, or events held in the targeted DACs, at times and venues convenient for community members to participate?
5. Were translators provided when/where needed?
6. Were materials and other information distributed in a timely manner?
7. Have members of DACs taken a lead role in project(s) proposed for their community(s)?
8. Have new projects been recommended and needs assessed by DACs, with the support and help of IRWMP Steering Committees?
9. Have other partners been identified?
10. Were local governments and elected officials involved, or at least kept informed, of outreach with their constituents?
11. Did any projects receive the technical support of the IRWMP consultants, and were the participating DACs satisfied and engaged in the process?
12. Were two DAC-projects per subregion submitted in 2008/2009 for grant funding?
13. Have members of each disadvantaged community that was targeted for outreach invited to participate and/or become members of IRWMP Sub-regional Steering Committees? Did any accept the invitation? Do they know that the invitation is open, if/when they can participate in the regional format?
14. Was the IRWMP stakeholder database updated to show all who participated in DAC outreach meetings, workshops, and events?

Responsible Party	Necessary Resources
Outreach to DACs: Task leaders identified by Steering Committee assisted by IRWMP consultants	Staffing, technical support, AV, presentation materials, translation expertise, meeting support such as refreshments, name tags, etc., possibly transportation
Technical support to DACs: IRWMP consultants and/or other in-kind services	Technical expertise, grant guidelines, presentation materials, translation expertise
Updated stakeholder-database: Each Steering Committee is responsible to give stakeholder information to IRWMP consultants to enter and update database	Sign-in sheets, other clearly printed/typed contact information from all IRWMP DAC-outreach meetings, interviews, workshops, other



INTERIM OUTREACH PLAN TARGETING DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES IN THE GREATER LOS ANGELES REGION

6. MEDIA RELATIONS AND PUBLIC INFORMATION ABOUT IRWMP DAC-RELATED EFFORTS AND OPPORTUNITIES

Media relations will augment the IRWMP grass roots outreach efforts described in the previous section. Community newspapers look for stories about local people and issues, and will often publish information that local readers need – such as when and where to meet to get involved with one of the projects being undertaken by IRWMP Steering Committees in partnership with DACs. Further, as the DACs and IRWMP Steering Committees work together to develop and implement projects that improve water quality, supplies and/or open space to the benefit of local communities, those success stories will be told through the media and should be viewed as encouragement for other disadvantaged communities to pursue similar projects.

Other public information tools are needed to keep the IRWMP accessible to the general public and members of disadvantaged communities who may not be reached through the outreach activities described earlier in this plan. These tools are aimed at those who seek out the IRWMP: a dedicated phone number to call for information and the website which contains up-to-date information about local, subregional and regional IRWMP efforts.

Objectives

- Build awareness of opportunities for DACs to become involved in local projects.
- Build awareness of successful DAC-IRWMP projects so that other communities can find encouragement to pursue similar efforts that will benefit more disadvantaged communities.
- Give representatives and residents of DACs in the Greater Los Angeles Region access to information about opportunities to be involved in their IRWMP Steering Committees and planning activities.

Strategies

- Distribute a press release to local (community) newspapers or other local media about each DAC outreach opportunity where the public is invited.
- Encourage representatives of each DAC project to encourage their local media outlets to cover their stories.
- Report success stories and thereby provide information about IRWMP process through media relations focusing on publications in DAC communities.
- Establish a dedicated phone number for IRWMP information and include it in DAC-outreach related press releases.
- Maintain the IRWMP website and update it at least quarterly with information related to DAC outreach and projects.

Outreach Activities

- Identify local media outlets. Some of the ways to do this are:
 - Find out from local governments and/or organizations who are familiar with the target DACs

- News racks located in the DACs (e.g., on sidewalks, in convenience stores and restaurants, in supermarkets)
 - Local library
 - Internet search
 - Civic and business organizations' newsletters
 - School newsletters
 - Newsletters from houses of worship
 - Neighborhood Councils' websites
- Prepare and distribute announcements of outreach events, workshops, and/or meetings open to the public at least two weeks in advance. The purpose of this activity is to supplement invitations to residents and businesses in the target DACs to become aware of -- and invited to -- meetings, workshops, and/or other public participation opportunities.
 - Contact the local media outlet to find out deadlines for announcements and articles.
 - Occasionally refer to scheduled Sub-regional Steering Committees and include an open invitation for the public to attend.
 - Prepare and distribute press releases about significant project milestones. The purpose of this media relations activity is to publicize progress and to encourage others to undertake similar efforts through the sharing of success stories.
 - If appropriate and possible, include quotes from members of DACs who are participating in the development of the project, local elected officials who are well informed of the progress of outreach and the benefits of the potential project(s), and members of the IRWMP Subregional Steering Committee.
 - Include information that would enable DACs to inquire about opportunities for their communities to participate in Sub-regional Steering Committee meetings (e.g. contact local government and/or organizations; IRWMP information phone number and website address.)
 - Coordinate ground-breaking events to publicize projects that have been successfully developed with DACs to the major milestone of beginning the construction phase.
 - Coordinate these events in the community with DACs.
 - Establish a dedicated phone number for public inquiries and to invite residents, businesses, or representatives of DACs to consider participating in the IRWMP process.
 - Include this phone number in press releases related to DAC outreach and projects.
 - When beginning outreach in a DAC, prepare an announcement to be included in newsletters disseminated by large houses of worship, hospitals and clinics, large high schools, senior centers, recreation centers and community centers located in disadvantaged communities that advises of the start of the collaborative effort and gives the information phone number.
 - Maintain the IRWMP website and update it at least quarterly with information related to DAC outreach and projects.
 - Continue to publicize the dates, times, and locations of Subregional Steering Committee meetings.

How to Measure the Effectiveness of this Element of the Outreach Plan

1. Was a press release prepared and distributed for each DAC-outreach opportunity that was open to the public?
2. Did members of the target disadvantaged community(s) report they saw something in their local media outlets (newspapers, newsletters, others) about the event/workshop/meeting?
3. Has a dedicated information phone number been established and was that number included in press releases?
4. Was the website updated quarterly and can people who use the website easily find information about Subregional Steering Committees being held in their watersheds?

Responsible Party	Necessary Resources
Media relations – To be led by the designated outreach task lead	Sample media advisory; sample news release; list of local media outlets; list of potential local sources to provide quotes and/or information for the press release
Approvals – Draft press releases to be reviewed and approved in advance by chairs of the respective Steering Committee involved in the DAC-outreach	Reviewer needs to be informed of deadlines
Dedicated phone number and monitoring - LA Co. DPW	Dedicated phone number for public calls
Website – LA Co. DPW	Information provided by chairs of Subregional Steering Committees