

Greater Los Angeles Integrated Regional Water Management Plan
South Bay Steering Committee
April 17, 2007
3:00 pm – 5:00 pm
West Basin MWD

Meeting Notes

Present:

Leighanne Reeser
 Rob Beste
 Robb Whitaker
 Mary Zauner
 Terri Grant

Scott Valor
 Frank Kuo
 Kathleen McGowan
 Tom West
 Shana Epstein (phone)

Andree Hunt (phone)
 Ed Means (phone)

Agenda Item	Topic/ Issue	Discussion	Action Item/Follow Up
1	Welcome, Introductions	Robb led introductions.	
2	Review March Meeting Notes	March meeting notes were briefly reviewed. Tom provided summary of highlights.	Email comments to Tom West and Leighanne
3	April 5 Leadership Committee meeting	<p>a. LACFCD is drafting a letter on behalf of the LC to DWR to recommend how to divide funding in LA Ventura funding area among LA, Ventura and Upper Santa Clara. County updating matrix to include miles of coastline and disadvantaged communities. Draft letter will be sent to LC for review and comment.</p> <p>b. County received draft contract from DWR on Round 1 grants. LACFCD is concerned about some of the language and will be looking at other models to assist in its discussions with DWR. The current template puts too much burden on LACFCD in terms of liability. DWR wants local oversight group to take over asap and work out details with individual project proponents. However, this brings up issues with MOU and governance.</p> <p>c. LC agreed to extend consultant contract by a few months due to extended governance discussion.</p> <p>d. LC requested that steering committees to give authorization to their chair to decide at May 3 LC meeting on governance if the decision is the recommendation by the SC.</p>	
4	IRWM Program News	a. State staff did tour 8 of 13 projects that were part of the Round 1 grant award. LACFCD organized and led the tour. Approval letter should be coming this week	

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>on grant award. State asking for updated project schedules and payment schedules.</p> <p>b. Frank recommended that projects without clear quantified benefits should start thinking about how to communicate benefits to State. State is making a clear statement that they want to see benefit, even after 1 year of implementation.</p> <p>c. Frank reiterated that State is doing expedited 2nd round of Prop. 50. Have alluded that those receiving Round 1 won't be able to go after Round 2. Guidelines to be released at the end of April.</p> <p>d. Still some uncertainty about Prop. 84/1E and how/when it will be rolled out. Some concern about some regions that don't yet have IRWMP.</p>	
5	Greater LA Region Decision-Making Structure	<p>Ed provided brief background on data collection effort on governance issue and summarized his presentation to the LC. LC asked Ed to have information presented to SC for feedback and decision at May LC meeting.</p> <p>Ed walked through the following four primary decision areas:</p> <p>a. LC role. Questions/comments from SC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which MOU is referred to? Modifying the modified MOU. • Teri- Need clarification on what LC's role is to equitably divide grant funding. Currently not available but SC's are in the process of developing. • Ed- Needs to be explicit that the LC makes final decision on projects to receive funding. <p>b. LC structure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation of Ed to expand SC representation to 3 members in each sub-region. • Described 2 options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 3 reps from each sub-region, each representing a different WMA ○ 2 reps plus a WMA rep; rotate WMA rep among the different steering committees • Scott commented that the current organization is sufficient in terms of representation. WMA should have regional perspective. Scott commented that the larger structure dilutes effort and potentially only a few parties end up pushing the agenda. • Concern about expanding the LC. Is there enough people able to 	<p>SC recommendation to be presented at LC:</p> <p>2 reps from each steering committee</p> <p>Reps + FCD select reps from 5 WMAs Based on nominations from each steering committee.</p> <p>3 year terms for SC reps and 2 years for WMA reps.</p> <p>At least 1 rep should be the chair from each sub-region.</p> <p>No rotation of WMA seats.</p>

		<p>commit enough time. Time commitment is significant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robb expressed support for expanding LC membership and having WMA representation within each SC. • Rob Beste commented that 16 members on the LC doesn't seem too large. Greater distribution of votes provides more robust decision-making. Commented that cities should be active if they are interested in the process- be more inclusive. • There was concern expressed that there is the potential for more conflict of interest with WMA's being selected by the sub-region, in contrast to the LC selecting the reps for the WMA's. If WMA selection were rotated among the sub-regions, it would take 15 years for a WMA to come back around to a particular sub-region (assuming 3 year term) • Possible recommendation is to have LC appoint WMA representatives. Robb expressed concern about political issues with this proposal. Definition of roles could help. Politics could be diffused by having 2 reps from each sub-region. Also, could have a 1 year rotation to avoid issue if someone selected to represent a WMA turns out to not be qualified or have the appropriate regional perspective. • Each SC should be allowed to nominate up to 5 people for WMA's. <p>c. SC role</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Need to make sure that, if people in the sub-region want to be active, SC's should be more inclusive. <p>d. Issues of transparency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ed summarized that on the issue, the establishment of a more formal structure as well as a recusal process (to avoid agencies voting on their own projects when funding is at stake) would go a long way toward helping. • Question was asked by Shana: are we making this more complicated than necessary? There was some concern that a rotation system was unclear. SC chairs would be tasked with tracking participation and terms. • Conflict of interest—State law only pertains to people personally benefitting. Ed commented that it is the perception of conflict that the governance discussion is trying to address, not necessarily the legality. • Some type of mechanism is needed to keep track of agencies' time commitment so that those which provide significant resources can be 	
--	--	---	--

		<p>acknowledged.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to beef up responsibility of sub-region to outreach to stakeholders. This shouldn't be the responsibility of the County. 	
6	Project Identification and Prioritization	<p>Tom walked through the proposed prioritization framework</p> <p>Frank, comment from State that applying for planning grant may delay implementation grant.</p>	Email comments on framework to Tom. Tom will email final draft framework out to SC for further comments.
7	Future Agenda Items/Other Items	<p>Fran Spivey-Webber now appointed to SWRCB. SC needs to talk about replacing her spot. Previously represented Mono Lake Committee and Audubon Society.</p> <p>Robb asked if we are assuming that we can't go for Prop. 50 funding and if so, should the LC take a position on this?</p>	
8	Next Meeting	<p>Conflict with BCWTF meeting. Email around to SC to get new date after the 15th.</p> <p>May 16, 2007 3:00 pm to 5:00 pm Location: West Basin MWD</p>	