## **IRWMP Leadership Committee**

Greater Los Angeles Integrated Regional Water Management Plan February 25, 2009 9:30 a.m. to 12 p.m. Los Angeles County Flood Control District 12<sup>th</sup> Floor Executive Conference Room

## Present:

Siya Araumi, LACFCD
Joe Bellomo, Cities of Agoura Hills and
Westlake Village
John Biggs, Brown and Caldwell
Hector Bordas, LACFCD
Barbara Cameron, City of Malibu
Grace Chan, MWDSC
Donna Chen, City of Los Angeles, BOS
Kathi Delegal, LA County DPW
George De La O, LACFCD
Jan Dougall, Las Virgenes MWD
Belinda Faustinos, RMC
Norma Garcia, LA County Parks and Rec.

Sharon Green, LACSD
Grace Kast, San Gabriel Basin WQA
Burt Kumagawa, LA County CEO
Wendy La, Main San Gabriel Basin
Watermaster
Ed Means, Malcolm Pirnie
Rich Nagel, West Basin MWD
Sherwood Natsuhara, City of Vernon
Andy Niknafs, City of LA DWP
Lisa Northrop, USFS-ANF
Melih Ozbilgin, Brown and Caldwell
Rochelle Paras, LA County DPW
Leighanne Reeser, West Basin MWD

David Rydman, LA County DPW
Francis Spivy-Weber, State Water
Resources Control Board
Persephene St. Charles, RMC Water
Nancy Steele, LASGRWC
Dan Sulzer, Army Corps of Engineers
Robb Whittakker, Water Replenishment
District
Carol Williams, Main San Gabriel Basin
Watermaster
Theresa Wu, Water Replenishment District
Tony Zampiello, Raymond Basin
Mary Zauner, LACSD

Topic/Issue		Discussion	Action/Follow up
1.	Welcome, Introductions and Purpose	Hector Bordas opened the meeting at 9:39 a.m. with introductions.	No Action
2.	Approval Meeting Summary from January 28, 2009	Minutes were distributed to the Leadership Committee for review and comment.  Minutes were approved unanimously, with the following changes:  Clarify that letter to Governor was to include a list of frozen grants.  Change previously required 80% match to 10% match.	Minutes approved
3.	Public Comment Period	No Comments.	No Action
4.	IRWM Program News	George De La O provided the following updates on IRWM Program News.  Letter to Governor  The following updates were given on the Letter to the Governor regarding the suspension of grant funds:  Received additional comments and the letter is being revised to incorporate  Revised letter will be distributed to the Leadership Committee for review.  Need interested parties to submit list of projects in a table containing the following information:	<ul> <li>George De La O will     distribute revised Letter to     the Governor to     Leadership Committee     members.</li> <li>County is requested to     provide updates on the     status of the grant freeze     at Leadership Committee</li> </ul>

	Name of Project Reference Number Granting Agency Project Type  Proposition 50  DWR determined they did not need a live demonstration of the web-based invoicing system and will accept the invoices, provided they are in the proper and consistent format. As a result, the web-based system is open to project proponents to begin submitting their invoices. The current plan is to submit an invoice to the State who will process the invoice up to the point of payment. The State will pay the invoice when the freeze on grant fund is lifted. It was also noted that the budget agreement may have helped, however the State still needs to determine if they cancel the bonds after the freeze is lifted. More information should be available in 3 to 4 weeks. Request was made that the County provide updates to the Leadership Committee on the status of the grant freeze to assist project proponents in their efforts for planning to carryout projects/programs during the grant freeze.  Adding Projects to Plan	meetings.
5. State Water Resources	It was noted that projects need to be in the IRWM Plan to be eligible for funding, but those projects could be added to the Plan via amendment or addendum.  Plan Updates Discussion occurred on the process to amend the IRWM Plan and covered the following points:  • How is the plan updated?  • Does a plan amendment require a formal approval?  • Do representatives have delegated authority to act, or would it require additional approvals?  • Request made that Leadership Committee members provide report on their authority from their respective boards and/or councils  • Recognize the need for continued updates and lay out guidelines and processes for the future updates to the plan  State Recycled Water Policy & Basin Salt / Nutrient Management Plans	George De La O     volunteered to develop     draft language regarding     the process to amend the     IRWMP.      No Action
Control Board's Recycled Water Policy	The overview on the State Recycled Water Policy and Basin Salt / Nutrient Management Plans Was given by Francis Spivy-Weber and covered the following points:  • Framework is bigger than just the recycled water; it includes items such as stormwater and water conservation towards the consideration of the regional	• NO ACTION

impacts of programs.

- There is a fast track for projects to be developed concurrently with the development of the salt and nutrient plans.
- Board instituted a Blue Ribbon panel for consideration of constituents of emerging concern.
  - Currently developing list of panelists.
  - o Board will assign someone to be 100% in charge of the program.
- This is a good policy to move forward on recycled water.
- Key to moving forward is the salt and nutrient plans
  - Need to be developed for all basins and sub-basins
  - Developed basic framework for plans including monitoring, reporting, etc.
  - Did not lay out how things should be done since the regions are different. Parties need to meet with the local Regional Board to decide how to move forward.

## **Stimulus Package**

The overview on the Stimulus Package was given by Francis Spivy-Weber and covered the following points:

- Funds through Department of Public Health ~ \$160m
- Funds through State Board ~ \$280m
  - From EPA to revolving loan fund money, in addition to existing funding, but with different requirements.
  - At least 50% has to be spent on grants
    - Requires legislative action to execute
  - 20% targeted to "Green Projects"
    - Recycled Water, Conservation, LIDs
  - o Need to be "Shovel Ready"
    - People must be working on the project by February 16, 2010
    - Need to specify how many people will be re-employed, newly employed, or "saved"
  - State Board voting on rules and how to roll out on March 17, 2009
    - Initial draft rules are out, comments due by March 4, 2009
    - Final parts of rules will be out prior to March 17<sup>th</sup> session
    - There will be a 10 day comment period.
    - Recommended that interested parties register to get notices.
    - Workshops will be conducted at every Regional Board on revolving loan fund.

		<ul> <li>Projects need to be on the pre-application list.</li> <li>Can register now at FASST on the State Board Website (www.waterboards.ca.gov)</li> </ul>	
6.	Steering Committee Chair Reports	<ul> <li>Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers Steering Committee         Belinda Faustinos provided the following highlights from the Steering Committee         Meeting held in February:         </li> <li>Discussed reaching out to the Gateways Cities regarding their representation on the Steering Committee</li> <li>Added the Environmental Justice Coalition for Water as a voting member of the Steering Committee</li> <li>Approved Belinda Faustinos as Vice Chair for the Steering Committee.</li> <li>Discussed the project selection criteria strawman and provided recommendations</li> <li>Belinda Faustinos volunteered to head up the DAC subcommittee for the Steering Committee.</li> </ul>	• No Action
		Upper Los Angeles River Steering Committee Nancy Steele and Andy Niknafs provided the following highlights from the Steering Committee Meeting held in February:	
		<ul> <li>South Bay Steering Committee</li> <li>Rich Nagel provided the following highlights from the Steering Committee Meeting held in February: <ul> <li>Discussed the project selection criteria strawman</li> <li>Working on project prioritization</li> <li>Sent questionnaire requesting project information to project proponents for top 20 projects</li> <li>Working on identifying which projects are really ready to proceed.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
		Upper San Gabriel and Rio Hondo Rivers Steering Committee Grace Kast provided the following highlights from the Steering Committee Meeting held in February:  • Worked on developing a DAC Project for the expedited grant funding  • Discussed the project selection criteria strawman	

	<ul> <li>Prioritized top 30 project to present to Steering Committee</li> <li>Want to put together a suite of projects to tell a story</li> <li>Discussed the Ad Hoc Committee and want clarification on the purpose of the Ad Hoc Committees.</li> <li>San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments is working on their own list of 6-10 projects from the IRWMP list that they will be promoting</li> </ul>	
	North Santa Monica Bay Steering Committee  Barbara Cameron provided the following highlights from the Steering Committee  Meeting held in February:  Discussed the project selection criteria strawman  Developed list of frozen projects  Worked on project scoring to prioritize projects by what works best for subregion  Reaching out to agencies and organization in the subregion to participate  Noted that Regional Projects need a collective definition.	
7. Project Selection Criteria and Funding	George De La O reviewed the Project Selection Criteria strawman and the following comments were made regarding the strawman:  Process should be open and flexible  Need a transparent process  Need guidelines to pick projects that will perform better  Maintain Steering Committee autonomy  Need guidance from Leadership Committee to help Steering Committees pare down the project lists.  Criteria should focus on IRWMP Targets  Avoid assigning dollar value to subregion (i.e. \$5m): say 1/5 of funding instead.  Don't specify funding match limits especially on DAC projects  Avoid surprises to project proponents by failing to meet expectations, especially regarding funding match.  Need Steering Committees to delegate leeway to Leadership Committee representatives for flexibility to negotiate.  Allow Steering Committees to review the revised strawman.  Allow Steering Committee to review the project selections made by the Leadership Committee.  How will conflict of interest be addressed between Leadership Committee Members and their projects?  Is there an allocation of funding for Regional Projects?  When can subregions present their projects to the Leadership	Ad Hoc Committee will review comments and revise the strawman,

	Committee?	
O Court Addiso	Water Concernation	N. A.C.
8. Grant Ad Hoc Committee(s) Status a. Water Conservaltion b. Disadvantaged Community c. Regional Projects	<ul> <li>Water Conservation Leighanne Reeser distributed the minutes from the Ad Hoc Committee Conference call to the Leadership Committee for review and the follow discussion occurred:         <ul> <li>Focusing on Regional Project across all 5 subregions</li> <li>MWD has structure to administrate program                 <ul> <li>Utilize staff time as in-kind service</li> <li>Need to address agencies not in MWD service area, but there are ways to work around the issues.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Need to figure out how much money to request for grant; early estimate is \$4m.</li> </ul> </li> <li>DAC         <ul> <li>The Ad Hoc Committee had not met yet, first meeting scheduled for after the Leadership Committee Meeting.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Regional Projects</li> </ul>	No Action
	Robb Whittaker provided an overview of the Ad Hoc Committee Meeting and covered the following points:  • Purpose  • Review Regional Projects in the project database  • Look at existing and potential regional projects outside of Water	
	Conservation  Bring Regional Projects to the Leadership Committee  Develop definition for Regional Projects  Identify funding needs for Regional Projects  Identify Agency leads for Regional Projects	
O 2000 Canaultant	Incorporate Regional Projects into the selection process      Nellie Orbitain provided on undete on the following Consultant Astinitias:	N. A. M.
<ul> <li>9. 2008 Consultant</li></ul>	<ul> <li>Melih Ozbilgin provided an update on the following Consultant Activities:         <ul> <li>Region Acceptance Process</li> <li>Developed scope and budget with County</li> <li>Holding on executing the scope until DWR provides final guidance</li> </ul> </li> <li>Project Prioritization         <ul> <li>Moving forward with Steering Committees to bring projects up to the Leadership Committee.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Disadvantaged Community Outreach         <ul> <li>Ready to provide guidance on project development</li> <li>Ready to support efforts of Subgroup looking at implementation of</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	No Action

	the DAC Outreach Plan.	
10. Water Supply Gap Analysis Presentation	Ed Means gave a presentation on the Water Supply Gap Analysis.  Motion made and approved unanimously to adopt Water Supply Gap Analysis.	Motion made and approved unanimously to adopt Water Supply Gap Analysis.
11. Future Agenda Items / Other Items	Request to agendize discussion of Basin Plans. In addition, AB410 looks to allocate \$5m from the \$100m unallocated in Prop 84 for Basin Plan development. Request made to have Rich Nagel invite Tracy Egoscue to discuss Basin Plans.  Agendize subregional project presentations.  Motion to start the meetings at 9:00am instead of 9:30 am was turned down.	No Additional Action
12. Meeting Adjournment	Meeting Adjourned at 11:53 a.m.	No Action
13. Next Meeting:	Greater LA County IRWMP Leadership Committee: Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, Wed., March 25, 2009, 9:30 a.m. – 12 p.m.	