

**Greater Los Angeles Integrated Regional Water Management Plan  
South Bay Steering Committee  
August 14, 2007  
10:00 am – 12:00 pm  
West Basin MWD**

**Meeting Notes -- DRAFT**

**Present:**

Don Geisinger  
Paul Herzog  
Mario Acevedo  
Tom West  
Rich Nagel

Scott Valor  
Robb Whitaker  
Leighanne Reeser  
Mary Zauner  
Wing Tam

Michael Dannucci  
Jose Luis Escajeda  
Meridith McCarthy

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Topic/ Issue</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Action Item/Follow Up</b>
<b>1</b>	Welcome, Introductions	Rich Nagel led introductions.	
<b>2</b>	July 19 Leadership Committee meeting	Only topic discussed from the July 19 meeting was the LC's discussion about hiring a lobbyist. It was suggested that the IRWMP coordinate/collaborate with Green LA initiative which has hired a lobbyist (Verde Group). City of LA Mayor's office has a lobbyist (Leslie Friedmann Johnson).	
<b>3</b>	Review July Meeting Notes	There was no discussion on the July Meeting minutes.	Email comments to Tom West and Leighanne.
<b>4</b>	Steering Committee Nominations a. WMA qualifications b. WMA Nominees c. Meridith McCarthy d. LC name change	A. The WMA qualifications were presented to the SC. There were no comments.  B. WMA Nominations: LC will vote in September on nominees. Formal action needed by SC on formal nominees. After LC meeting, LC will have 16 representatives. The SC discussed their previous nominees. For the record, the nominees were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Groundwater: City of Torrance (Rob Beste)</li> <li>• Surface Water: Metropolitan Water District (Grace Chan)</li> <li>• Sanitation: County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles (Sharon Green)</li> <li>• Stormwater: City of LA, Watershed Protection (Shahram)</li> <li>• Open Space/Habitat: Santa Monica Bay Restoration Commission (Shelley Luce)</li> </ul>	Email comments on WMA qualifications to Tom West and Leighanne.  Meridith McCarthy to present her thoughts to SC for further outreach to DACs.

*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>There were no objections. Following changes/comments noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change LACSD nominee to Steve McGuinn. Sharon will be his alternate.</li> <li>• Add Jeff Kightlinger from MWD as rep. He will note his alternate; it may be Grace Chan but likely someone higher up.</li> </ul> <p>Motion was made and seconded to accept nominees. Unanimously approved by the SC.</p> <p>C. Meridith McCarthy from Heal the Bay: Mary gave a brief overview of her background and current role with Heal the Bay in order for the SC to consider her nomination to be on the SC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oversees programs for Heal the Bay including beach clean up, outreach, adopt a beach program, and Compton Creek watershed efforts.</li> <li>• Worked through 4 organizations to help train community members on watershed education. Received a stipend from NICE to participate.</li> <li>• Mary is keen to help out with education efforts.</li> </ul> <p>Tom W. suggested adding item to September agenda to have presentation by Meridith on outreach and to brainstorm more about what the South Bay SC should be doing. Meridith to put together her thoughts prior to then.</p> <p>Motion was made and seconded to have Meridith join the SC. Unanimously approved.</p> <p>D. Leadership Committee Name Change</p> <p>The SC previously recommended keeping the name Leadership Committee. A motion was made and seconded to reaffirm this recommendation. The SC unanimously approved the motion.</p>	
5	MOU Discussion	<p>Ed Means described the approach that the consultant team is taking to help draft a new MOU. Key steps are (1) meet with steering committees, (2) present a draft MOU to the LACFCD and (3) recommend that the LC conduct drafting sessions before finalizing.</p> <p>Consultant team asked that the steering committee to weigh in on (A) funding structure and (B) who should sign MOU.</p> <p>A. Funding Structure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was suggested that the funding relationship be at the steering committee and agency/city level (rather than at the LC level) since this is</li> </ul>	<p>Email comments on MOU discussion to Tom West (<a href="mailto:twest@rmcwater.com">twest@rmcwater.com</a>) and Ed Means (<a href="mailto:emeans@pirnie.com">emeans@pirnie.com</a>)</p>

		<p>where these entities tie into the process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key is that the larger agencies are going to still contribute to the effort no matter what--without large entities funding the IRWM effort, it will disappear.</li> <li>• Still need to outreach to smaller entities to make even nominal contributions as this creates a stronger and more positive message.</li> <li>• In theory, all steering committees should contribute equally but this is not realistic—it should be a goal.</li> <li>• It was suggested that when requesting contributions that the SC refer to the contributions made to date to put more pressure on others who have not contributed.</li> <li>• In requesting contributions, there is an implicit assumption that the process is going to work in effectively distributing Prop. 84 funds. However, it is not clear as to the definition of “what’s working”. What about looking at population density in terms of contribution? County still struggling with how to divide up Prop. 84 funding within the funding area.</li> <li>• The issue was raised: Are we talking about a correlation between contributions versus benefits?</li> <li>• Discussion seems contradictory talking about regions when we should be talking about watersheds. What about contributions from wealthier cities like Beverly Hills?</li> <li>• At steering committee level, need to have more outreach to help secure at least some nominal commitment. Engagement will become increasingly important as we talk more about land use issues. It was noted that many cities already don’t participate in watershed task force meetings.</li> <li>• The question was raised: Is it the responsibility of the steering committees to get the cities engaged? The SMBRC can do that too with their member cities. It was noted that it is good to at least document outreach efforts by the SC to help in discussion at LC meeting level.</li> </ul> <p>B. Who should sign MOU?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Depends on what is in MOU. Is this to maintain and update the IRWMP. Need to have timing and governance in it. The ones who sign it are those who know about the process and participating.</li> <li>• The SMBRC Foundation was brought up as an example of lessons learned and that having too many signatories is a problem. At minimum, signatories should include the Leadership Committee members,</li> <li>• It was suggested to maybe set a sunset/reaffirmation date to help refresh interest and participants.</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there one MOU for the RWMG and a separate MOU for participants?</li> <li>• Frank asked about what will the State wants. Tom commented still in flux but want to see more definition. In general, the State defined RWMG is seen as the body governing the effort. In LA's case, this would be the LC, and would be the ones to sign.</li> <li>• Need to make sure there is a step for attorney review.</li> <li>• Another suggestion was to develop an umbrella MOU and then have another agreement at steering committee level?</li> <li>• The next MOU should not be tailored to a single Proposition. It should clearly identify roles and responsibilities (1) for LC members (2) for SC members and (3) for stakeholders. Stakeholder piece will be generic so that everyone doesn't feel.</li> <li>• There was discussion about requiring signatories to be on the Leadership Committee; it was agreed that the MOU can't require them to commit in writing.</li> <li>• On the subject of term limits, the SC did not recommend. The SC thought a re-affirmation step was sufficient. Term limits seem to complicate things. MOU should give agencies a mechanism to opt out of responsibilities at any time.</li> </ul>	
6	Project Integration and Re-Prioritization Exercise: Follow Up Activity	<p>A. Prioritization: Tom W. indicated that the final prioritization framework was being developed and should be ready for distribution in the next week. Tom will provide an overview of the prioritization framework at the next SC meeting in September.</p> <p>B. Project Integration: Tom W. indicated that the consultant team was wrapping up the project integration exercise. Currently the remainder of the consultant team is reviewing and providing input to the integration opportunities identified in each sub-region. The final results from the project integration exercise will be distributed at the September SC meeting.</p> <p>Frank Kuo noted that the County has already updated some of the fields in the database to obtain additional information. These updates include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• if project is construction or non-construction</li> <li>• if project needs funding or has been funded</li> <li>• another check box if project has been updated</li> <li>• export feature to download to excel and to outlook to contact project proponents</li> </ul> <p>Tom noted that the consultant team will work with Frank to determine how to communicate database changes/updates with Frank once the prioritization framework is finalized.</p> <p>Frank commented that on website, a new page has been created that posts</p>	SC members to review project lists and scoring information and provide comments to Tom West via email ( <a href="mailto:twest@rmcwater.com">twest@rmcwater.com</a> )

		<p>page grants available.</p> <p>With regard to Prop. 50 Round 1, Frank commented that the County was now looking at using one of their JPA's (the Watershed Conservation Authority) as the contracting vehicle with the State.</p> <p>The SC requested that there be a discussion at the next LC meeting on dividing \$215 million for Prop. 84. Apparently the Upper Santa Clara area is targeting \$25 million while Ventura is targeting \$60 million. LA hasn't put a number on the table yet but wants input from the Steering Committees before doing so.</p> <p>Future bond measure may put \$2billion more into the IRWM program. Thus, structure of Prop. 84 agreement within the funding area is a critical step as it will establish precedence.</p>	
7	Funding Contributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rich indicated that the Region needs to fast track contributions so that the consultant effort in the next phase can continue with no lack.</li> <li>The current target is to raise \$1 million for funding efforts over the next 18 months. Region-wide this translates to \$200,000 per sub-region.</li> <li>Rich asked that those who are able should proceed with requesting funds from their boards.</li> <li>Draft letters will be sent out from County requesting contributions. Frank indicated letter will be posted to website and each entity expected to respond.</li> <li>County has committed \$250,000 for entire effort.</li> <li>West Basin indicated that it needs a letter by October 31 that says what each entity has pledged toward the effort. Formal Board action isn't needed by a formal letter at the GM level would suffice. Copies of draft letters were distributed at meeting. Leighanne will email out electronic versions.</li> </ul>	Leighanne to email out sample funding request letter from West Basin to the SC.
8	Future Agenda Items/Other Items	<p>The following items were proposed to be included in the agenda for the September steering committee meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outreach (Meridith McCarthy)</li> <li>MOU</li> <li>Prioritization and integration</li> <li>Presentation from project proponents. One presentation for 15 minutes or maybe 2 for 10 minutes.</li> </ul> <p>Tom W. recommends that SC members invite others to attend the SC meetings and notify Leighanne and Tom to make sure we know and include in future agenda.</p>	Email to Tom West and Leighanne the name and contact info of people who should be invited to attend future SC meetings.

9	Next Meetings	<p>Leadership Committee Meeting September 6: May move up to 8:30 am or 9 am. LACDPW in Alhambra</p> <p>South Bay Steering Committee Meeting -TBD September 11: 10 am to noon. West Basin MWD</p>	<p>Please confirm your attendance at the next SC meeting with Leighanne.</p>
---	---------------	--	--