

Greater Los Angeles Integrated Regional Water Management Plan
Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles River Watershed
May 15, 2007
9:00 am to 12 noon
Gateway Cities Council of Governments
16401 Paramount Boulevard
City of Paramount

Present:

Art Aguilar, Central Basin MWD
 John Biggs, Brown and Caldwell
 Michael Drennan, Brown and Caldwell
 Belinda Faustinos, RMC
 Sharon Gates, Long Beach PRM

Terri Grant, LA Co. DPW/FCD
 Meherwan Irane, City of LA
 Frank Kuo, LA Co. DPW/FCD
 Wendy La, LA Co. DPW/FCD
 Joone Lopez, CBMWD

Sherwood Matsuhara, Vernon
 Dan Mueller, City of Downey
 Steve Myrter, City of Paramount

Topic/Issue	Discussion	Action/Follow up
1. Welcome, Introductions and Purpose	Belinda Faustinos opened the meeting at 9:09 AM with introductions.	
2. Review 05/01/07 Meeting Minutes	Discussion on the meeting minutes was deferred to the regularly scheduled Steering Committee Meeting on 06/05/07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action, meeting minutes from 05/01/07 will be reviewed on 06/05/07 Steering Committee Meeting.
3. 05/02/07 Leadership Committee Meeting Summary	The Leadership Committee provided recommendations at their May 2 meeting on Decision-Making Structure for the Steering Committees to review, discuss and come to an agreement. Review of recommendations and discussion was deferred to the regularly scheduled Steering Committee Meeting on 06/05/07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action, recommendations on Decision-Making Structure will be reviewed at 06/05/07 Steering Committee Meeting.
4. Project Prioritization	Handouts were provided for discussion. Projects were ranked using the project prioritization framework for each of three categories: regional priorities, subregional priorities, and readiness to proceed. Handouts were provided which identified the top 30 projects in each of these three categories. The consultant also provided a fourth handout which added the scores of the regional priorities and subregional priorities together. Another handout was provided which summarized the number of projects in the subregion which made progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group agreed to use the list of top 30 projects as determined by adding the scores from the Project Prioritization Framework for the regional and subregional priorities. • The group agreed to modify the

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>towards the quantified targets in the IRWMP.</p> <p>Discussion covered the following topics:</p> <p>It was acknowledged that there is likely significant gaps between the benefits provided by proposed projects in the subregion, and the regional targets.</p> <p>The basis of the prioritization was the Project Prioritization Framework and the data generated from the Long Form on the IRWMP Database (which was developed based on Prop 50 criteria). The group agreed that the Long Form needs to be simplified. The group recommended that a place holder for critical needs should be developed for the subregional priorities, to encourage projects that addressed local aging infrastructure or other critical needs such as DAC. While the group could not agree on the specific definition of critical needs, it acknowledged that ultimately the Steering Committee should determine whether projects addressed critical needs.</p> <p>The group acknowledged that there is a need to set subregional goals and priorities, based on regional targets, such that projects in the subregion could be compared against subregional goals. The group also acknowledged the importance of designing projects to fill gaps as well as looking at various means of integration between ideas, agencies and geographic regions.</p> <p>The value of an updated database was presented as a means for other funding entities or groups to identify and implement projects outside of grant funding such as Prop 84. The group also discussed the idea of limiting the number of projects an agency can submit, but that would limit the ability for other groups to find projects to benefit the region. No conclusion was reached on this idea.</p> <p>A comment was made that the database should be revised in the future to acknowledge the issue of sustainability, and should provide points for benefits such as energy conversation.</p> <p>The group also discussed the fact that the Project Prioritization Framework may be used as a model for state guidelines being developed for Prop 84, and should be provided to the state to provide leadership on this issue. The group acknowledged that the Framework should therefore be somewhat consistent across the LA Region. It was suggested that the final Tech Memo summarize the philosophy in the development and use of the framework to provide more information.</p>	<p>subregional ranking criteria for the Lower SGLA Subregion to include bonus points for projects that serve disadvantaged communities (DAC)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group also agreed to modify the definition of small projects as project with costs less than \$1M rather than less than \$5M. • The group requested the consultant re-rank projects with new criteria for DAC and Small Projects (as described above). • The group agreed to recommend that the Project Prioritization Framework be revised to include the addition of “Sustain Local Infrastructure” in Regional Priorities, and that the LAIRWMP Database be revised to reflect benefits for this category. • The group acknowledged that the Project Prioritization Framework is a useful tool to compare proposed projects and benefits to regional quantified targets, but that ultimately the Steering Committee must develop a formal strategy for developing a comprehensive program of projects that best represents a balance of large projects and small projects, a balance of projects geographically, and a balance of projects representing all water management areas.
--	---	--

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>5. Project Identification and Integration</p>	<p>The group discussed and asked questions about how the framework scored projects and what factors led to the differential scoring between what appeared to be similar projects. The consultant indicated that they are contracted to work with the subregion to integrate 10 projects for purposes of improving individual projects or sets of projects to achieve multiple benefits or geographic integration.</p> <p>The group agreed to integrate the top 8 projects in the list of projects developed by adding the scores of the regional and subregional categories. The group also reviewed a map provided by the consultant which located all projects in the subregion, and agreed to integrate two sets of projects that are geographically adjacent to each other. The groups of projects identified for the geographic integration are as follows: project numbers 101, 104, 105, 106, 116, 118; and project numbers 178, 179, 184, 185, 186.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group agreed to use the top 8 projects for the integration exercise after the consultant re-ranks the projects based on the recommendation provided above. • The group agreed to invite the project proponents from the top 8 projects and as well as the project proponents for the two groups of projects located adjacent to each other geographically. • Determine if Project Proponents attendance is required at next Steering Committee meeting is need for integration exercise.
<p>6. Discuss Future SC Activities</p>	<p>It was acknowledged that the consultant scope of work will be completed by approximately June 30, 2007, and that there are continued needs of the Steering Committee during the second half of 2007, including developing subregional targets, developing a formal strategy for reviewing results of the Project Prioritization Framework, preparing a set of projects for Prop 84 application expected towards the end of the year.</p> <p>The group deferred the discussion for the need for staff/additional support to the June 5 meeting.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders were advised to think about the upcoming needs of the SC during the second half of 2007, to consider their ability to participate in the financial support for future activities of the Steering Committee, and to bring those ideas to the next meeting of the SC on 06/05/07.
<p>7. Next Meeting</p>	<p>Steering Committee Meeting: June 5, 2007 12:30 to 2 pm. Executive Board Room – Lakewood City Hall – 5050 Clark Avenue, Lakewood, CA</p> <p>Leadership Committee meetings on June 7, 2007 at 9:30, at LA County DPW, Alhambra.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

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