

IRWMP Leadership Committee

Greater Los Angeles Integrated Regional Water Management Plan
 April 23, 9:30 am to 12 pm
 Los Angeles County Flood Control District
 12th Floor Executive Conference Room

Present:

Art Aguilar, Central Basin MWD
 Edward Belden, LASGRWC
 Joe Bellomo, Cities of Agoura Hills and Westlake Village
 Rob Beste, City of Torrance
 John Biggs, Brown and Caldwell
 Hector Bordas, LACFCD
 Grace Burgess, WQA
 Barbara Cameron, City of Malibu
 Grace Chan, MWDSC
 Donna Chen, City of Los Angeles, BOS

Kathi Delegal, LACDPW
 Joyce Dillard
 Sharon Green, LACSD
 Frank Kuo, LACFCD
 Shelley Luce, SMBRC
 Ed Means, Malcolm Pirnie
 Andree Hunt, Malcolm Pirnie
 Sherwood Natsuhara, City of Vernon
 Andy Niknafs, LADWP
 Lisa Northrop, US Forest Service
 Melih Ozbilgin, Brown and Caldwell

Rocelle Paras, LACFCD
 Mark Pestrella, LACFCD
 Leighanne Reeser, West Basin MWD
 Randy Schollerman, WQA
 Nancy Steele, LASGR Watershed Council
 Kevin Wattier, Long Beach Water
 Tom West, RMC
 Tim Worley, RMC
 Brett Wyckoff, DWR
 Tony Zampielo, Raymond Basin
 Mary Zauner, LACSD

Topic/Issue	Discussion	Action/Follow up
1. Welcome, Introductions and Purpose	Mark Pestrella called the meeting to order at 9:45 AM with introductions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action
2. Review Meeting Summary from March 26, 2008	The minutes from the March Leadership Committee Meeting were distributed. Minutes approved without changes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes approved.
3. Public Comment Period	Comment received regarding the Grand Avenue Civic Park, noted that there didn't seem to be much focus on the water quality aspects and the park only seemed to focus on tourism. There was a comment that Grand Avenue Civic Park does have some water quality aspects associated with it and that there will a follow up to look at those benefits.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action
4. IRWM Program News: a. Prop 84 (& 1E) Grant Program Status b. Prop 50 -- \$25m Grant Contract	<p>Prop 84 (&1E) Guidelines are expected this summer from DWR, in addition DWR is still waiting on the budget to finalize the amount of grant funding available. Prop 84/1E money will probably not be available until at least the 1st of the year (2009).</p> <p>Prop 50 The Flood Control District Board took action on April 15th to accept the Prop 50 grant money and administer the grant. The MOU for project proponents was also accepted by the board. With the final acceptance of the grant there is a desire to do a press event at one of the IRWMP project locations to announce the grant</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members were requested to send any suggestions regarding the Prop 50 Press Event to Hector Bordas.

<p>5. Steering Committee Chair Reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Planning Needs- Planning Grants b. IRWMP Update c. DAC Outreach d. Project Definition/Integration e. Other 	<p>reception, showcase projects and possibly hold the Leadership Committee Meeting.</p> <p>Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers The Steering Committee discussed and provided feedback on the DAC Outreach Program. In addition the Committee discussed the process for project prioritization at the subregional level. It was also noted that the next Steering Committee was on Memorial day, so the meeting would be moved up one week to May 19, 2008.</p> <p>North Santa Monica Bay The Steering Committee has scheduled a project workshop for June 10th. They are also looking to focus on other sources of funding outside of Prop 84 to fund additional projects. The Steering Committee also discussed the existing project database and formulated the following comments/suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add "Education" as a project type • Information that was entered does not always show up • Unable to see what was entered or printed • No prompt to save work before you exit <p>Flood Control District commented that they added staff to cleanup the database and make it more user friendly, with the help of the Consultant Team. The Steering Committee is also looking to identify DAC projects in the area focusing on park agencies, environmental education, and water quality.</p> <p>There was also discussion regarding funding of watershed coordinators and how Southern California only has 4 and is not getting its fair share of funding. Consensus was that Southern California should be advocating for a fair share of all grant funds. Watershed Coordinator Melina Watts sent a letter to the State regarding equitable share of funding to Southern California. It was suggested that the Leadership Committee send a letter to the State to support funding for Southern California Watershed Coordinators, it was suggested that more discussion occur on watershed coordinators and tie it directly to how it relates to the IRWM process.</p> <p>South Bay The Steering Committee has scheduled a project workshop for June 3rd. They also discussed updating projects in the database to prepare for the workshop to have current stakeholders talk about their projects. The Committee also discussed some issues with the database, the DAC outreach plan, and the formation of a subregional DAC subcommittee.</p> <p>Upper Los Angeles River The Steering Committee elected 2 additional members (Rebecca Drayse and Mary Benson) to the Steering Committee. The Committee also discussed IRWMP Grants</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood Control District will work to cleanup the database and make it more user-friendly. • Shelley Luce will forward a draft letter to Hector Bordas regarding the watershed coordinator funding, which will also include background materials and summary of funding, for distribution to the Leadership Committee. • Andy Niknafs will send Hector Bordas the information and presentation regarding resource conservation districts.
--	--	---

	<p>for small areas, DAC outreach plan outline, detailed review of projects and outreach to stake holders. ULARA will begin assessing projects and DAC outreach at their May meeting. In addition there was a presentation on the Green Solutions project and Resource Conservation Districts. The Green Solutions presentation has been scheduled for a future LC meeting.</p> <p>Upper San Gabriel and Rio Hondo Rivers The Steering Committee discussed the DAC outreach plan outline. Specifically that they are on board for the goals and objectives of the program and were looking forward to the discussion with Chris Harris. They also noted that they wanted better clarity on what has done previously, what needs to be done, what assistance is needed in finding avenues to outreach to the DAC communities, as well as the best way to identify the needs in those communities. The Committee also discussed updating projects to prepare for prioritization and let the stakeholders know the Committee has not forgotten them. The Committee also decided to wait to hold workshops until there is more information regarding the Prop 84 Guidelines.</p>	
<p>6. Gateway Region IRWM JPA Meeting</p>	<p>The Leadership Committee was informed that the April 22nd Meeting with Gateway Region IRWM JPA did not occur because only Kevin Wattier was available to attend the meeting for the Gateway Region. The Leadership Committee reaffirmed their desire to meet with the Gateway Region JPA to discuss the JPA's issues with the Greater Los Angeles County IRWM Region. In addition, the Leadership Committee discussed their intent to continue with and promote the Greater LA IRWMP and wanted the LSGLA Subregion to benefit from the process and participate in the IRWM. The desire was also expressed to continue to outreach to, understand and support the LSGLA Subregion.</p> <p>Discussion occurred regarding the cancelled meeting consisted of following summary points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The JPA Board voted to go ahead with the meeting, provided certain conditions were met. Specifically that a smaller group for the Greater LA IRWM should attend and that representatives from the Watershed Council of Ventura County and Upper Santa Clara River Watershed be present as well. • Members of the Leadership Committee felt that the intent of the letter sent by the Gateway Region IRWM JPA was to discuss the division of grant funds. • Discussion occurred on the intent of inviting other IRWM groups to the meeting, which was set up to discuss issues between the Gateway JPA and the Greater LA IRWMP. Some members expressed that the change in the meeting purpose signaled intent to only divide up funding and to not work together. Further, it was commented that if the intent was to coordinate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Leadership Committee will continue to attempt to set up a meeting with the Gateway Region IRWM JPA to discuss issues between the two IRWM Groups. • Motion passed stating: The Leadership Committee will consider a policy to address potential conflict of interest issues relating to members serving on two overlapping IRWM Regions.

	<p>activities in the Los Angeles County, other IRWM groups did not need to participate in the meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was general consensus that while all agencies participating in the IRWM program have priorities specific to their agency, the intent of the program was to work together to solve the region’s water and open space issues. • The question was raised whether the meeting of the four IRWMP groups would mean an even larger planning area with one plan to cover the entire funding area. • It was commented that there should be coordination on how overlapping and adjacent IRWMPs should work together. • A comment was made that the Groundwater Water Management Area Representative made a previous effort to meet with members of the Gateway JPA and was turned down in favor of meeting with the Leadership Committee and it was frustrating that the meeting with the Leadership Committee did not occur. • Some members felt strongly that the ultimate objective is cooperation and that the groups cannot begin to cooperate with out knowing what the issues are. There is a general feeling that the JPA is avoiding a discussion about the issues. <p>Discussion occurred regarding the relationship between the Greater Los Angeles County IRWMP and the Gateway Region IRWM JPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some members stated that they were still unclear on the specific intent of the Gateway Region IRWM Group and wanted a clarification. Some members had the impression that the intent of the JPA group was to pursue funding from Prop 84/1E independent of the Greater Los Angeles IRWM. • The opinion was expressed that a group like the Gateway Region IRWM JPA is good when it works through the subregional / steering committee process. • Kevin Wattier clarified the position of the Gateway Region IRWM JPA as “11 or 12 cities with mutual interest working together to develop a plan more conducive to their needs” and that this group is “not going away”. • It was commented that some members of the Gateway Region IRWM JPA have stated that the region does not need the Greater LA IRWMP and will seek money from grants on their own. • The view was also expressed that members of the Gateway Region IRWM JPA have the perspective that the Leadership Committee is trying to make the JPA go away. • Kevin Wattier clarified the position of Long Beach Water Department and the 	
--	--	--

	<p>Long Beach City Manager, in that they hope what is developed through the Gateway Region IRWM JPA can be a subset of what is done by the Greater Los Angeles County IRWM and they intend to participate in the LA IRWM process. They did not see any issue with trying to plan at a region-wide level. In addition Kevin stated the members of the Leadership Committee have an open invitation to attend the JPA meetings, which occur on the 2nd Thursday of every Month, starting at noon, at the Gateway Cities Center.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted that the region was originally broken up into separate planning areas and was required to work together by the State and the fragmentation was working against the previous directives of the State. • The view was expressed that the subregions were formed to create greater participation of stakeholders and the desire is to get all members of the subregion represented. The question was raised about how that could occur if some members are also participating in a JPA with the intent to compete with the Greater LA IRWM for the same funding. • The statement was made that the other subregions are working to function within the larger group. Specific to that point the NSMB representatives noted that the region's priorities are not completely in line with the subregion's priorities. However, the subregion is working at the subregional level to develop their own priorities and gather information to improve the discussion and description of their subregion for the update to the IRWMP. They felt that the JPA is doing the same activities and felt those activities should be focused on improving the Greater LA IRWMP to better address their subregion's priorities instead of forming a new group. • It was stated that initially some members of the Gateway Region expressed concern that the Greater LA IRWMP was not meeting the needs of the Gateway Region. Members of the Leadership Committee felt that they went out of their way to address the Gateway Region concerns regarding their local issues and then the Gateway Region went on to make their own IRWMP anyways. • The desire was expressed to find out if the Gateway Region IRWM was going to participate in or stay out of the LA IRWM process. The general feeling is that preparing a separate plan indicates the intent to not participate. It was also noted that no other subregion is forming their own group or developing their own plan. • The desire was expressed that the Gateway Region IRWM JPA and the Greater Los Angeles County IRWMP still need to meet and discuss the specific issues between the two groups. <p>Discussion occurred regarding the relation between the MOU and Operating</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Guidelines and co-participation on the Leadership Committee and the Gateway Region IRWM JPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership Committee members wanted to know what issues the members of the Gateway Region IRWM had with the MOU and Operating Guidelines and what changes would they like to see in the documents. The statement was made that the issues regarding addressing local issues and projects are resolved through the new MOU and Operating Guidelines. • The view was expressed that some members of the Leadership Committee do not see how participating on the Boards of both groups could work. This point was clarified to indicate the concern is valid only regarding participation on the Leadership Committee and not participation in the Subregion. • The organization of the Gateway Region IRWM JPA was clarified that every member agency of the JPA appoints a representative to the Board. • The question was raised if members of the Gateway Region IRWM JPA Board can also serve as Chair or Vice-Chair of a subregion and that the potential conflict of interest issue needs to be addressed. It was stated that the preference would be to deal with these issues in the Operating Guidelines. The desire is to have all members participate in the IRWM process through the subregions, but potential for conflict of interest regarding Leadership Committee participation needs to be clarified. • It was noted that the RWMG formed by the MOU serves as a group and signing the MOU accepts the LA IRWMP. Further, signing the MOU is a condition of Leadership Committee membership and explicitly states acceptance of the MOU and Operating Guidelines. • Some members felt strongly that any one member of Leadership Committee, after signing the MOU, should not be on the Gateway Region IRWM JPA Board, while participating in the Leadership Committee. • Motion made stating: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “The Leadership Committee will consider a policy to resolve issues from members serving on two overlapping IRWM Regions.” ○ The motion passed with Kevin Wattier abstaining • The Committee restated the desire to have the members participate in the subregions and for discussions between the two IRWM regions continue to resolve issues between the two groups. 	
<p>7. MOU and Operating Guidelines</p>	<p>Ed Means covered the MOU and Operating Guidelines for consideration and approval.</p> <p>Motion made to approve the MOU and Operating Guidelines. An addendum was made and accepted regarding the motion stating that the Leadership Committee should develop a conflict of interest policy for the operating guidelines as soon as</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motion to approve MOU and Operating Guidelines passed with one abstention. • Consultant directed to draft language regarding a

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>possible and bring it to the Leadership Committee for a vote. The following discussion occurred regarding the motion and addendum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be a signature page for the 16 members of the Leadership Committee to sign and a supporting page for anyone else to sign. • Boards could also adopt a simple resolution to state that they support the process. • It was noted that the group should incorporate codes and disclosures, incorporate water and land use and get land users involved. • It was requested that the MOU and Operating Guidelines be sent out electronically to all members. • Once a majority of the Leadership Committee signatories approve the document, the remaining LC members have 60 days to adopt the MOU. • It was requested that the consultant draft potential conflict of interest policy language. <p>The Motion and Addendum passed via voice vote with one abstention.</p>	<p>conflict of interest policy.</p>
<p>8. 2008 Consultant Activities</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Update to IRWM Plan in 2008 b. Identifying Planning Needs c. Disadvantaged Community (DAC) involvement – Q&A Period 	<p>Melih Ozbilgin provide an overview on the 2008 Consultant Activities:</p> <p>IRWMP Update A technical memorandum on the IRWMP update will be distributed for the May Steering Committee Meetings for review, comments, and discussion. The feedback will be collected and findings, feedback and a revised technical memorandum will be presented to the Leadership Committee in May or June. The Draft plan update is scheduled for September or October, with the update Finalized in November.</p> <p>Planning Needs Feedback and Comments on planning needs are being collected from the Steering Committees and will be incorporated into the IRWMP Update.</p> <p>DAC Outreach Consultant clarified the DAC part of the scope of work as being to facilitate 5 workshops in an attempt to screen and develop 2 projects per subregion.</p> <p>Chris Harris reviewed the DAC outline, draft workshop agenda, and led a discussion on the DAC Outreach plan. It was noted that the plan was put together to be manageable and can accomplish the goals. While the outreach plan for near-term</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee Members invited to send comments on DAC Workplan and Workshop to Melih Ozbilgin.

	<p>activities needs to be realistic and manageable, the strategies for the long-term vision should reflect a best-case approach. Many grass roots outreach suggestions were made, all of which would be part of an optimum long-range outreach plan. With that, the Leadership Committee will be positioned to demonstrate that the Greater Los Angeles region is poised to launch a model outreach effort and would thus be an excellent candidate for the funds mentioned by LC members.</p> <p>Discussion occurred on the definition and identification of DACs and consisted of the following summary points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State defines as 80% of state median income; this definition was used to identify DACs in the original IRWMP. • Recent IRWMP conference looked at other factors such as household size, school lunch program participation, graduation rates, etc. • DWR is working on developing DAC guidance for the Prop 84/1E Guidelines and will likely be discussed at the upcoming Prop 84/1E workshop on May 15th. • The committee can cast a wider net than just household income to encourage more DAC participation • Cities and Agencies are the key in identifying DACs in their areas • Information on DACs in unincorporated areas of the county can be obtained through Census Tract Data as well as the areas already identified by the County as DACs. • There needs to be cooperation between agencies, people who know the communities and the consulting team. • The Flood Control District offered to share their experiences in DAC outreach with any interested parties. <p>Discussion occurred on the identification of DAC projects regarding the location of the project and who the project benefits an consisted of the following summary points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The intent is to have the Steering Committee members as primary working group with the DACs with support from the consultants. • In order for a DAC project to be recognized it needs to go through a needs assessment to show benefits to DACs. • It was noted the DAC maps should be overlaid with the existing project location maps as a first step which can then be used to fill in the gaps. <p>Discussion occurred on grant funding and technical assistance availability for Disadvantaged Communities and consisted of the following summary points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted that the DACs are the least organized and least able to put 	
--	--	--

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>plans together.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a very important need to engage the groups and people that know the communities best. • There is a separate \$100M pot of money and there is a need to help them be informed, affect the process and participate to benefit from the available grant funding. • It was also noted there is \$5m in grants available for planning and \$10m in grants available for implementation. <p>Discussion specific to the Draft DAC Outreach Plan Outline consisted of the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The workplan can go beyond the consultant scope of work. However, there will need to be a follow up discussion on how to follow up on the expanded process. The current plan is written to address what is practical to do, but can be expanded as much as the Leadership Committee would like. • The effort will take a lot of effort on the ground, especially from the Steering Committee Members. • Noted the workplan needs to meet our goals, objectives and needs. • The plan should outline what opportunities are attainable and not create false expectations. There is a need to inform DAC groups about what we can do, rather than just asking what they need, and then their needs are based on the framework of what can be provided. • Highlights document could be prepared too help disseminate the information on what can be done through the IRWM program. • Area managers need to push schedule to meet the goals of the DAC outreach program. • There was concern expressed about making the new process work. <p>Discussion on the DAC Workshop Agenda and Outreach Schedule consisted of the following summary points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The goal for the DAC workshops is to have them occur in August. However, this will depend on how the outreach is progressing. • The DAC outreach program will need to be incorporated into the IRWMP Update. 	
<p>9. Foundation Funding</p>	<p>Nancy Steele proved an update on the status on the letter of inquiry to the Annenberg Foundation. The Annenberg Foundation removed their hold on reviewing environmental inquiry letters and the letter sent regarding funding is now moving through the pipeline.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action

<p>10. Future Agenda Items / Other Items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Water Management Area Presentation b. LA Co Flood Control System Presentation c. Dept. of Water Resources – AB 1420 d. Green Solutions / Green Visions Presentation e. Lobbying Effort / Strategy 	<p>The Flood Control District offered to give a WMA Presentation on the County Flood Control System. In addition Belinda Faustinos and Shelley Luce volunteered to give a WMA Presentation in May regarding the Green Visions and Green Solutions Projects.</p> <p>Request has been made to DWR to give a presentation on AB 1420 for the May Leadership Committee Meeting.</p> <p>The Flood Control District mentioned the potential funding measure for water quality projects as well as AB 564 to amend act to revise code to allow the collection of an assessment fee.</p> <p>West Basin requested the budget be allocated to cover use fees for facilities and lunches for Subregional Workshops. Motion passed unanimously.</p> <p>Future agenda should include the discussion on the conflict of interest language.</p> <p>Schedule future discussion on allocation of funding among subregions.</p> <p>Future agenda should include Gateway Region IRWM JPA report by Kevin Wattier.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motion passed to authorize the use of budget to provide lunches and cover facility fees for Subregional Workshops.
<p>11. Meeting Adjournment</p>	<p>Meeting Adjourned at 12:15 pm</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action
<p>12. Next Meeting:</p>	<p>Wednesday, May 28, 2008 9:30 am to 12:00 pm 12th Floor Executive Conference Room Los Angeles County Flood Control District</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •