

# IRWMP Leadership Committee

Greater Los Angeles Integrated Regional Water Management Plan  
 November 26, 2008 9:30 a.m. to 12 p.m.  
 Los Angeles County Flood Control District  
 12<sup>th</sup> Floor Executive Conference Room

**Present:**

Art Aguilar, Central Basin MWD  
 John Biggs, Brown and Caldwell  
 Hector Bordas, LACFCD  
 Grace Chan, MWD  
 Donna Chen, City of LA, BOS, WPD  
 Kathi Delegal, LA County DPW  
 George De La O, LACFCD  
 Jan Dougall, Las Virgenes MWD

Tom Erb, Los Angeles DWP  
 Norma Garcia, LA County Parks and  
 Recreation  
 Ken Hu, LA County DPW  
 Shelley Luce, SMBRC  
 Randal Orton, Las Virgenes MWD  
 Melih Ozbilgin, Brown and Caldwell  
 Mark Pestrella, LACFCD

Leighanne Reeser, West Basin MWD  
 Bertha Ruiz-Hoffman, LA County Parks  
 and Recreation  
 Nancy Steele, LASGRWC  
 Dan Sulzer, Army Corps of Engineers  
 Tony Zampielo, Raymond Basin  
 Mary Zauner, LACSD

Topic/Issue	Discussion	Action/Follow up
1. <b>Welcome, Introductions and Purpose</b>	Hector Bordas opened the meeting at 9:45 a.m. with introductions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Action</li> </ul>
2. <b>Approval Meeting Summary from October 22, 2008</b>	The minutes from the October Leadership Committee Meeting were distributed to the Committee. The minutes were approved unanimously with the corrections provided by Mary Zauner.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minutes approved with changes</li> </ul>
3. <b>Public Comment Period</b>	No Comments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Action</li> </ul>
<b>4. IRWM Program News</b> a. Proposition 50, Round 1, \$25 million Grant Contract b. Proposition 84 & 1E Grant Program Status	<p><b>Prop 50</b>                  The web-based invoicing system for project proponents is ready to go, but waiting for California Department of Water Resources (DWR) to approve the system. The Los Angeles County Flood Control District (LACFCD) is holding off on accepting invoices from project proponents until approval. LACFCD will hold a meeting with DWR and project proponents to review and discuss the system. There have been recent staff changes at DWR regarding the managing of Prop 50 and the LACFCD is working on getting up to speed with the new staff at DWR. Web submission of project quarterly reports is working and quarterly reports were accepted and forwarded to DWR at the end of October.</p> <p><b>Prop 84 &amp; 1E, SBxx1</b>                  A handout summarizing the recent DWR workshops (re:Prop 84 &amp; 1E and Bill SBxx1) was distributed. The Leadership Committee discussed guidelines, timeframe, requirements, funding allocation, and the region acceptance process. Regarding the Region Acceptance Process, there is still a strong desire to continue to work with the Gateway Cities JPA to address existing issues and integrate the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LACFCD will continue to work with DWR to get approval of Prop 50 invoicing system.</li> </ul>

	<p>Gateway Cities JPA into the Greater LA County IRWMP. Regarding the funding split between Greater LA County, Ventura County, and Upper Santa Clara River for their funding area, the regions are reviewing statistical data provided by LA County for use in the funding allocation formula. The general feeling of the Leadership Committee was to continue working on the funding allocation methodology within the funding area, even if the first round has the potential to be competitive.</p> <p>There was a question raised regarding the allocation of funding among the subregions within the Greater LA County Region. The general consensus was that the Leadership Committee should provide some guidance on criteria for equitable funding splits among the subregions. The Leadership Committee should lay out the process in advance so the Steering Committees can best select projects for the grant application.</p>	
<p><b>5. Steering Committee Chair Reports:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Disadvantaged Community Outreach</li> <li>b. Planning Needs / Project Prioritization / Workshop</li> <li>c. IRWMP Update</li> </ol>	<p><b>South Bay Steering Committee</b>  The Steering Committee met in November and discussed the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Selected representatives for the three Ad Hoc Committees (Water Conservation, Disadvantaged Community (DAC) &amp; IRWMP Projects)</li> <li>• Reviewed the Basin Plan and Conservation Targets</li> <li>• Discussed continuing consultant support for meetings as well as possibly adjusting meeting schedules to bimonthly or self supporting some of the meetings. Objective was to look at the optimum solution.</li> <li>• Updating and reviewing projects to identify priority projects.</li> <li>• Planning to conduct workshops in December to identify projects to submit to the Leadership Committee in January.</li> <li>• Reappointed Robb Whittaker as Vice Chair for the subregion.</li> </ul> <p><b>Upper Los Angeles River Steering Committee</b>  The Steering Committee met in November and discussed the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Working on getting project proponents to update their projects.</li> <li>• Planning on a workshop in January to refine project prioritization criteria</li> <li>• Working to identify DAC projects and groups that could use assistance as well as developing lists of DAC groups in the subregion</li> <li>• Did not select representatives for Ad Hoc Committees. The Steering Committee felt it was better to just have one Ad Hoc Committee.</li> <li>• Committee had a preference for continuing consultant support of meetings.</li> <li>• Reappointed Nancy Steele as Vice Chair for the Subregion</li> </ul> <p><b>Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers Steering Committee</b>  The Steering Committee met in November and discussed the following topics:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create agenda item to discuss water conservation package for next Leadership Committee Meeting</li> </ul>

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

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Selected representatives for the three Ad Hoc Committees (Water Conservation, DAC &amp; IRWMP Projects)</li> <li>• Committee has been working with project proponents to clean up project database information.</li> <li>• Held workshop to identify active projects.</li> <li>• Holding a second workshop in January for project proponents to give presentations on projects to inform the Steering Committee for the eventual selection of projects to submit to the Leadership Committee.</li> </ul> <p><b>Upper San Gabriel and Rio Hondo Rivers Steering Committee</b> The Steering Committee met in November and discussed the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reappointed Grace Kast as Vice Chair of the Subregion</li> <li>• Did not select representatives for the three Ad Hoc Committees. The Steering Committee was not interested in three Committees, feeling it was better to have the Leadership Committee make the final selection.</li> <li>• Steering Committee established subregional Ad Hoc Committees to look at a DAC water conservation project for non-English speakers, a DAC water quality treatment program focusing on well head treatment, and a recycled water pipeline.</li> <li>• Postponed project workshop to January</li> <li>• Worked on the weighting of subregional criteria and customizing criteria to Prop 84</li> <li>• Continued working on collaborating with the San Gabriel Council of Governments on project ranking and selection</li> </ul> <p><b>North Santa Monica Bay Steering Committee</b> The Steering Committee met in November and discussed the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Working on completing project prioritization in January</li> <li>• Reaching out to get absent stakeholders engaged in the process</li> <li>• Working on cleaning up project database as about half of the projects are not complete with the eventual goal of getting to a manageable list</li> <li>• The subregion is limited in terms of projects dealing with recycled water, indoor water conservation, groundwater and DACs, so the focus for project review is to develop projects dealing with outdoor water conservation and water quality instead.</li> <li>• Building a project ranking system that can be used for other grants.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>6. Sbx1 Ad Hoc Committee Status /</b></p>	<p>Question was raised on whether there is a need to continue with the three Ad Hoc Committees. Discussion on the question covered the following topics:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agendize for the January Leadership Committee</li> </ul>

<p><b>Purpose / Objectives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Water Conservation Package</li> <li>b. DAC Projects</li> <li>c. IRWMP Projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a need to tell the story behind all the aspects of the grant application (Water Conservation, DACs, and IRWMP Projects) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Need to work as a group to talk about and coordinate a region wide program</li> <li>○ Need to clarify what kind of Water Conservation would qualify under the DWR definition of Water Conservation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ One suggestion to determine how much water is being conserved, was for regional plant wastewater treatment plant managers to share wastewater plant inflow data as a measure of conservation</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Should the three Committees be replaced with one Project Ad Hoc Committee? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Need to define the role of the Leadership Committee in selecting projects</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Question was asked about how the regional projects are going to be considered in the project prioritization process. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ It was suggested that the regional projects be reviewed by the Leadership Committee. Consulting team was requested to provide a list of regional projects.</li> <li>○ Put projects into a larger context for the region</li> <li>○ Create a forum to meet and work on regional project issues (i.e. easily achievable water conservation projects vs. more expensive conservation projects)</li> <li>○ There is no rule against regional projects, but need to identify what can be done at the regional level.</li> <li>○ Develop a process where money is split between regional and subregional projects and define what projects are truly at a regional level. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ An example project is the DAC Outreach aspects of assessments and feasibility studies.</li> <li>▪ General feeling is that the projects should focus on the areas of greatest need, which will mostly break down on economic measures and focus on goals of water quality in the communities then on the outdoor activities and open space in the communities.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>meeting a discussion of the Leadership Committee's role in selecting projects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agendize for the January Leadership Committee meeting a discussion of definition of "regional" projects, and how they should be considered for selection</li> <li>• Consulting team to provide list of Regional Projects for Leadership Committee.</li> </ul>
--	---	--

<p><b>7. 2008 Consultant Activities</b></p> <p>a. Planning Needs / Project Prioritization</p> <p>b. Highlights “Lite” Document</p> <p>c. Disadvantaged Community Involvement</p>	<p>Melih Ozbilgin provided an overview of the following consultant activities:</p> <p><b>Project Prioritization</b> Moving forward with project prioritization at the subregional level. There is a need for guidance from the Leadership Committee on the funding allocations and criteria for the Steering Committees.</p> <p><b>DAC Projects</b> Working on equalizing the effort across all subregions to identify DAC projects. Need to focus on beginning to implement DAC Outreach Plan. Some workshops have been scheduled, but need further guidance from Leadership Committee on what aspects of the plan to move forward.</p> <p><b>Highlights “Lite” Document</b> The final version of the Highlights “Lite” Document was distributed. The final version incorporates the comments received from the Steering Committees, Leadership Committee, and stakeholders.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LACFCD will send electronic copy of Highlights “Lite” Document to the Leadership Committee Members.</li> </ul>
<p><b>8. Ad Hoc Committee for DAC Outreach Support</b></p>	<p>Agenda Item tabled to next Leadership Committee Meeting.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Action</li> </ul>
<p><b>9. Future Agenda Items / Other Items</b></p>	<p><b>New Director of the Flood Control District.</b> It was announced that the LACFCD has a new Director, Gail Farber. Ms. Farber started on December 1. She previously worked with the City of Orange, Caltrans and the City of Pico Rivera.</p> <p><b>Water Quality Funding Initiative.</b> LACFCD staff is working on formulating a position for County Board of Supervisors on water quality funding initiative and how to operate the funding aspect of the initiative. LACFCD has conducted extensive polling on the funding measure and has received a positive response from residents.</p> <p>Request made to get presentation from Regional Board on Basin Plans and recycled water.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Action</li> </ul>
<p><b>10. Consultant Contract Status and Extension</b></p>	<p>The Leadership Committee approved motion to adjust the consultant’s contract to add additional meetings to facilitate the IRWMP Process.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Motion made and approved to adjust consultant scope of work.</li> </ul>
<p><b>11. Meeting Adjournment</b></p>	<p>Meeting adjourned at 11:57 a.m.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Action</li> </ul>
<p><b>12. Next Meeting:</b></p>	<p>LA IRWMP Leadership Committee: Los Angeles County Public Works, Wednesday, January 28, 2009, 9:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No December Leadership Committee Meeting</li> </ul>

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

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

## DWR Prop 84 & 1E Workshop Overview

### 1) Region Acceptance Process

Issue draft guidelines for Region Acceptance Process	December 2008
Issue final guidelines for Region Acceptance Process	Late January 2009
Submit Region Acceptance Application	Late February 2009
Final Decision on Region Acceptance	April 2009

- Region must be approved as a Region to submit for grant funds.
- Process will include interview with the RWMG.
- Decisions on the Region Acceptance are planned to be made prior to the submittal deadline for the Expedited Implementation Grants.
- A Region need not be based solely on geographic feature. Other factors can use include water management issues, stakeholder composition, & water-related conflicts.
- If Region is not accepted at this time, they can try again for future grant cycle.

### 2) Funds Available

#### (a) Prop 84: SBxx1 appropriated \$181 million Statewide for IRWMP with \$100 million for implementation grants

- Grant Cap is 1/9 of Funding Area Allocation  $\$215\text{m} / 9 = \$23,888,889$
- Funding Area Cap is 1/3 of FA Allocation  $\$215\text{m} / 3 = \$71,666,667$
- Includes \$10m for DAC projects addressing water supply & water quality
- Includes \$20m for urban and agricultural water conservation (actual demand reduction)
- For Prop.84 Grant, application will not need to separate between DAC, Water conservation, and other IRWM projects. DWR will determine which project constitutes which pot of funds.
- Major consideration for the Grant will be Work Plan, Readiness, Budget, Need, Costs, Preferences, and Benefit to DAC.
- To qualify for implementation grant, IRWMP must meet provisions of the IRWM Planning Act Rewrite OR have an adopted Plan as of Sept 30, 2008 and agree to update IRWMP within 2 years.
- Applicants must comply with UWMP, GWMP, AB 1420 requirements, if the agency receiving funds has to meet such State mandates.
- Region will need to amend Plan with new project list prior to application.
- Beginning date for matching funds is still to be determined.

#### (b) Prop 1E: SBxx1 appropriated \$150 million Statewide for Stormwater Flood Management Projects w/Multiple Benefits

- \$100 million for flood control projects to addressing seismic safety issues
- Grant Cap is \$30m per project
- Multiple projects in an application are OK
- 1 PSP for both Prop 84 and Prop 1E.

#### (c) Timeframe for Implementation Grants

Issue draft guidelines for Implementation Grant	February 2009
Issue final guidelines for Implementation Grant	April/May 2009
Submit Implementation Grant Application	June 2009
Award Implementation Grants	August 2009

**(d) Prop 84: Planning Grants \$39 million**

Draft guidelines for planning grant	March 2009
Planning Grant Application Due	September 2009
Review/Draft decision and public comment period	November 2009
Planning Grant Funds	2010

Decision on Planning Grant will be independent of whether or not a Region is awarded an Implementation Grant.

**(e) Prop 84: Future Implementation Grants in Summer 2010 or later**

**3) Identify Projects Now Through April 2009**

(a) Prioritize Base on Best:

- Project
- DAC Project
- Water Conservation Project
- Flood Management Project
- Other Project (TMDL, Stormwater, etc.)

(b) Disadvantaged Community Projects

We have an "Adopted" Plan. Need to start the implementation "slowly."

(c) Need to have Funding Formula / Allocation Scheme to Subregions by end of February 2009



# 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.