

Consistency with IRWM Plan Standards

This attachment addresses how the standards for the IRWM Plan standards have been addressed by the Greater Los Angeles County Region Draft IRWM Plan. To simplify comparison with IRWM Plan standards, the structure of the document mimics the A through O structure of the standards. The table below summarizes where the individual standards are located within the Draft IRWM Plan.

IRWM Plan Standards	Location in IRWMP Document	
	Section #	Page #
A. Regional Agency of Regional Water Management Group	Section 1.6.1, 1.6.2	1-5, 1-9
B. Region Description	Section 2	2-1
C. Objectives	Section 3.1	3-1
D. Water Management Strategies	Section 4.1	4-1
E. Integration	Sections 4.2, 4.3	4-18, 4-28
F. Regional Priorities	Sections 3.3, 7.4, 7.7, 7.8, 7.9.2, 7.9.3	3-6, 7-9, 7-13, 7-18, 7-21, 7-22
G. Implementation	Section 5, 7.2, 7.2.3, 7.4.1	5-1, 7-6, 7-7, 7-10
H. Impacts and Benefits	Section 6	6-1
I. Technical Analysis and Plan Performance	Section 1.4, 7.7.2, 7.8	1-3, 7-15, 7-18
J. Data Management	Section 7.7	7-13
K. Financing	Section 7.5	7-11
L. Statewide Priorities	Section 3.4	3-7
M. Relation to Local Planning	Section 7.1.1	7-1
N. Stakeholder Involvement	Section 1.6, 7.2.2	1-5, 7-6
O. Coordination	Section 1.6.2, 1.7.3, 7.3	1-9, 1-16, 7-9

A. Regional Agency or Regional Water Management Group

Sections 1.6.1 and 1.6.2 in Draft IRWMP describe the Regional Agencies and the Regional Water Management Group. The Regional Water Management Group (RWMG) is the entity responsible for the development and implementation of this Plan. As illustrated in Figure 1-1 of the Draft IRWMP, the RWMG is structured around a Leadership Committee and five sub-regional Steering Committees.

The governance structure for the Leadership Committee and the Steering Committees is currently governed by interim operating guidelines. These guidelines were developed while the draft Memorandum

of Understanding (MOU) is undergoing legal review by the agencies that initially developed planning grant applications. At such time as the MOU is finalized and adopted, then the terms of that document will supercede the interim guidelines.

B. Description of Region

Section 2 of the Draft IRWMP describe the Region in detail with supporting maps to show the boundaries, cities, water related infrastructure, and major land use divisions. The Greater Los Angeles County Region, an area of approximately 2,058 square miles, is located in coastal Southern California, as shown in Figure 2-1 (Greater Los Angeles County Region Context). The Region contains portions of four counties, Los Angeles, Orange, Ventura, and San Bernardino, and is bordered by two other planning regions: the Ventura County Integrated Region (which consolidated with the effort in the Calleguas Creek Watershed) on the west and Orange County Integrated Region to the south. The Mojave Water Agency Integrated Region is located to the northeast of the Greater Los Angeles County Region.

The preparation of an IRWMP for this Region is appropriate, given the consistency of the major water resource management issues, including substantial dependence on imported water, poor surface water quality due to urban and stormwater runoff, opportunities to expand production and utilization of recycled water, and significant groundwater resources in much of the area. Thus, water resource management planning at this scale is an opportunity to estimate the potential for optimized use of stormwater, recycled water, and groundwater resources to reduce dependence on imported water and enhance water supply reliability.

C. Objectives

Objectives are described in Section 3.1 of Draft IRWMP. Objectives, planning targets, and strategies are listed in Table 3-1. To establish benchmarks for implementation of the IRWMP, quantifiable targets were identified for the 20-year planning horizon. Quantitative evaluations of current resource levels versus those needed or desired in 2026 provide the basis for the IRWMP objectives. The quantitative difference between current and future resource needs represent the quantitative “gap” that must be satisfied through IRWMP implementation. Objectives representing the quantitative “gap” were confirmed based on input and feedback from IRWMP participants and stakeholders.

D. Water Management Strategies

Section 4 of the Draft IRWMP describes how Water Management Strategies are integrated into the IRWMP. The identification of which water management strategies are included in this Plan is based on review of strategies, actions and opportunities identified in the Metropolitan Water District’s Integrated Resources Plan, the Urban Water Management Plans of regional water wholesale districts, Rivers and Mountain Conservancy’s *Common Ground, from the Mountains to the Sea*, the watershed and open space plan for the Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers prepared by the California Resources Agency, and recent watershed plans for eight major creeks and tributaries.

E. Integration

Section 4.2 of the Draft IRWMP describes the opportunities for integration of Water Management Strategies, while Section 4.3 discusses the benefits of integration. The integration of the identified Water Management Strategies could occur in several ways: Similar projects or programs could be geographically-integrated (e.g., to form a regional project or program); Individual agencies, cities, counties, or organizations could incorporate multiple strategies into specific projects or programs (e.g., multi-purpose projects); or Agencies, cities, counties or organizations could together work on collaborative projects or programs (e.g., multi-agency projects).

F. Regional Priorities and Schedule

As discussed in Section 3.3 on page 3-6 of the Draft IRWMP, based on input and review by the Leadership Committee, review of recent plans, including Urban Water Management Plans, Water Management Plans, and other regional plans, and input from agencies and stakeholders, the following short-term (e.g., three years) and long-term (20 years) priorities have been identified for the IRWMP.

Short-Term Priorities

- Utilize a regional and sub-regional committee structure for development and implementation of the IRWMP;
- Complete the Greater Los Angeles County IRWMP by January 1, 2007;
- Articulate quantifiable planning targets for water supply, water quality, flood management, and open space/habitat;
- Determine which water management strategies can contribute to meeting the identified objectives;
- Identify projects that will meet the gap between existing projects and the regional planning targets; and
- Maximize funding opportunities for project implementation from local, state and federal sources.

Long-Term Priorities

- Maintain a regional and sub-regional committee structure to oversee plan implementation and assure continued stakeholder input;
- Optimize use of recycled water, groundwater, desalination, and stormwater to enhance water supply reliability;
- Reduce demand on imported water sources;
- Protect groundwater supplies;
- Improve surface water quality to meet applicable water quality standards; and
- Preserve open space, conserve sensitive habitats, and protect special-status species.

The short-term and long-term priorities described above represent the current priorities. The IRWMP Leadership Committee is committed to maintaining the IRWMP as a living document, which will include updates as needed to reflect changing priorities and conditions. The Leadership Committee is anticipated to continue in its same role during IRWMP implementation. The Leadership Committee, representing the full array of water management strategy areas, has the responsibility and authority to modify and update IRWMP priorities during the subsequent implementation phase based on regional changes and other factors.

The schedule for IRWMP implementation is described in Section 7.4 of the Draft IRWMP, beginning on page 7-9. Table 7-4 presents a schedule for implementation of Step 2 projects.

The Leadership Committee will assess responses to implemented projects based on performance results. Performance results will be available to the Leadership Committee based on monitoring and data management activities. Implementation results will be compiled and reported as discussed in Section 7.7, Data Management, of the Draft IRWMP, beginning on page 7-13. Section 7.8 of the Draft IRWMP, beginning on page 7-18, details the performance measures that implemented projects will be assessed against. The Leadership Committee will review project performance and IRWMP priorities and will suggest any needed modifications to project sequencing based on implementation responses. Section 7.9.2 on page 7-21 discusses how project sequencing would be altered in response to implementation

responses. Section 7.9.3 on page 7-22 discusses how Leadership Committee decision making will be responsive to regional changes. Changes in regional priorities will be addressed during periodic meetings.

G. Implementation

Section 5 beginning on page 5-1 discusses specific projects by which the IRWMP will be implemented, as well as the entities responsible for implementing those projects. Section 7 of the Draft IRWMP discusses the framework for IRWMP implementation. Section 7.2 on page 7-6 describes the institutional structure for implementation. The Final IRWMP will establish a framework for integrated water resource management; however, as noted below, no single entity exists to implement the Plan. Thus, the long-term achievement of the objectives identified in the IRWMP will rely upon the continued oversight of the Regional Water Management Group (RWMG), the continued fiscal oversight of the Flood Control District of Los Angeles County (as fiscal agent for current and future State funds), and the individual actions of various agencies and jurisdictions to implement the projects and programs identified in the Final Plan. As the goals and objectives identified in the IRWMP are derived from various existing local plans, including water supply, water quality, resource management, and watershed plans, the ongoing implementation of those plans will assist in the long-term implementation of the IRWMP. Section 7.2.3 on page 7-7 discusses technical feasibility. Project timelines for priority projects are shown in Section 7.4.1 on page 7-10.

H. Impacts and Regional Benefits

Section 6 of the Draft IRWMP discusses the impacts and benefits of each project. The assessment of impacts and benefits is central to the identification of projects included in both the Proposition 50 Step 2 Implementation Grant application and the IRWMP. A benefit assessment framework is being developed to support benefit quantification as part of the IRWMP development process.

I. Technical Analysis and Plan Performance

As described in Section 1.4 beginning on page 1-3 of the Draft IRWMP, the technical analysis utilizes and adapts as appropriate technical information from the original planning grant applications and various existing plans, studies, and documents. The discussion of water supply relies upon water supply and demand information from the Urban Water Management Plans from many water agencies in the Region and the Metropolitan Water District's Integrated Resources Plan. The regional description and discussion of water quality issues is derived from local watershed plans (including Arroyo Seco Watershed Restoration Feasibility Study, Ballona Creek Watershed Management Plan, Common Ground, from the Mountains to the Sea, Compton Creek Watershed Management Plan, Dominguez Channel Watershed Management Master Plan, Malibu Creek Watershed Management Area Plan, Rio Hondo Watershed Management Plan, Sun Valley Watershed Plan, and the draft Upper San Gabriel River Watershed Management Plan), and existing and proposed TMDLs. All of these documents, and input from the stakeholder workshops, provide a basis for the mission, objectives, and planning targets articulated in the IRWMP, the Region's short-term and long-term priorities, and the water management strategies that are relevant to this Region.

The development of the IRWMP is supported by various Technical Memorandums (TMs) and related products, which deal with topics such as water management strategies, project integration, benefit/cost analysis, and framework for implementation, and provides the background and technical analysis that support the plan, including water supply and demand. Feedback from the Leadership Committee, Steering Committees, and stakeholder workshops will articulate how water management strategies can be integrated into regional project concepts and prioritization of which regional project concepts are most appropriate for the individual sub-regions, in response to characteristics of each sub-region.

Data gaps are discussed in Section 7.7.2 on page 7-15.

Section 7.8 beginning on page 7-18 discusses the performance measures, monitoring systems and mechanisms that will be used to measure the performance of the IRWMP and its projects and to allow for adjustments where necessary, a set of metrics has been established. Metrics at the IRWMP level were developed based on regional objectives to allow progress of the overall IRWMP to be measured. At the project level, metrics were developed to measure individual project performance based on the established goals of each project. Monitoring programs at both levels are planned to collect performance related data which will be analyzed and compared to the established metrics. Performance data will provide feedback into an adaptive management process that will be used to modify both project operations and the IRWMP implementation plan based on actual results. This section describes the monitoring methods and programs that will be used to collect data and the mechanisms by which this data will drive future improvements to projects and the IRWMP. Detailed monitoring procedures are established for all projects that will be implemented as part of the IRWMP.

J. Data Management

Section 7.7 on page 7-13 describes the data management process included in the IRWMP. The collection, management, and dissemination of data are an essential element to creating a sustainable integrated plan. Information needs to be available to regional leaders, stakeholders, and the public to facilitate effective planning and decision-making. A comprehensive data management approach will help to quickly identify data gaps, detect and avoid duplicate data collection efforts, support statewide data needs, and integrate with other regional and statewide programs.

As part of this IRWMP, data management strategies will be applied to coordinate data collection between implementation projects, leverage existing data available from ongoing statewide and regional programs, and provide timely data to stakeholders and the public, and consolidate information to be used in other state programs.

K. Financing

Section 7.5 on 7-11 discusses the financial resources needed to implement the IRWMP, which will come from a variety of funding sources. Table 7-5 on page 7-12 of the Draft IRWMP outlines the expected sources of funds. Local funds are anticipated to finance a significant percentage of project costs.

Funding sources have been identified for the 13 projects being submitted for the Step 2 application. These sources are summarized in Table 7-6 on page 7-12 of the Draft IRWMP. Local funds include funding from agencies such as the SMBRC and the Metropolitan Water District. Other secured funds include non-IRWMP state funds. Agencies have accounted for Operations and Maintenance (O&M) costs in their planning and have secured funds to ensure project continuity. O&M funds for the priority projects will be funded from the general O&M accounts of the individual agencies.

L. Statewide Priorities

Based on the IRWM Grant Program Guidelines, the state has identified a range of statewide priorities. In the Draft IRWMP beginning on page 3-7, Table 3-2 documents how the IRWMP and the Region's priorities are consistent with and promote statewide priorities. As evidenced by reviewing Table 3-2, development of the Draft IRWMP recognized and focused on consistency with statewide priorities in addition to identified regional needs.

Attachment 13 of the Step 2 application summarizes how both the individual and collection of projects submitted is consistent with and supports the identified statewide priorities.

M. Relation to Local Planning

As discussed in Section 7.1.1 beginning on page 7-1 of the Draft IRWMP, existing local water resource planning efforts encompass the full range of water management strategies. The foundation of the Draft IRWMP is built from previous and current local planning efforts. The goals, objectives, strategies, and projects included in the Draft IRWMP and the Step 2 application reflect local priorities that have been assimilated into the Draft IRWMP through stakeholder input at the regional and sub-regional level. Additionally, existing local planning documents were reviewed in combination with a call-for-projects to assimilate and reflect local planning efforts in the Draft IRWMP and identified implementation projects.

The IRWMP stakeholder process encourages interactive feedback between local planning and regional IRWMP planning. Local planning is conducted by cities and municipal agencies. Most of the cities in the Region are represented either directly, or through the participation of a Council of Governments (COG) representative. There are four COGs (Gateway Cities, Westside Cities, San Gabriel Valley Cities South Bay Cities) representing 78 cities, that have been active in the IRWMP process. Through the stakeholder workshops, the cities, COGs and municipal agencies advocated for their respective local planning needs and issues, which have been incorporated into the IRWMP. Subsequently, the outcomes from the IRWMP planning process have been disseminated by the representatives back to their local governments and planning agencies, allowing the IRWMP priorities and plans to be factored into local planning. For example, the Cities of Torrance and El Monte are updating their general plans in 2006, and the IRWMP will be used to inform and shape that process in areas related to water management.

N. Stakeholder Involvement

Stakeholder involvement is discussed in Section 1.6 of the Draft IRWMP. The stakeholder participation approach is centered on inclusiveness and transparency. Invitations to participate in stakeholder workshops, project identification, and plan development were transmitted to approximately 1,400 individuals representing hundreds of cities, agencies, districts, and organizations. Section 7.2.2 on page 7-6 discusses the possible obstacles to IRWMP implementation.

O. Coordination

State and Federal Agencies involved in the IRWMP are listed in Section 1.6.2 on page 1-10. Coordination with these agencies is discussed in Section 1.7.3 on page 1-16. Agency coordination is discussed in Section 7.3 of the Draft IRWMP, as described on page 7-9. The involvement of federal and state agencies will be critical during the implementation phase. Examples are provided below:

- Federal agencies such as the National Park Service own a great deal of land which can impact the North Santa Monica Bay watersheds. The National Forest Service manages large portions of the Upper San Gabriel and Los Angeles Watersheds.
- The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is a necessary partner in any dam related activities, such as the removal of Ridge Dam in the North Santa Monica Bay Watersheds. It also is important in conducting feasibility studies such as the Arroyo Seco Watershed, and may play a role in future funding opportunities related to ecosystem restoration along the rivers and major flood channels.
- The California Coastal Conservancy (CCC) plays an important role in projects near the coast. The Solstice Creek Southern Steelhead Habitat Restoration Project involves a cooperative agreement with the CCC.
- California State Parks is already an active stakeholder. Its participation is critical as many potential habitat projects may take place on state parks land. As an active project proponent, it can assist the IRWMP effort by communicating the importance of its projects to the public.