

Greater Los Angeles Integrated Regional Water Management Plan Meeting Notes – Upper Los Angeles River Watersheds Steering Committee

**June 6, 2007, 8 to 11 am
City of Glendale, Perkins Community Room**

Present:

Mario Acevedo, LA DWP
Ted Allen, LA DPW BOE
John Biggs, Brown and Caldwell
Shirley Birosik, RWQCB
Donna Chen, LA DPW BOS
Joyce Dillard
Renee Ellis, LA DPW BOE
Thomas Erb, LA DWP

Mark Hanna, LA DWP
Mark Horne, EIP Associates
Frank Kuo, LACo DPW/FCD
Wendy La, LACo DPW/FCD
Shelly Luce, SMBRC
Vivian Marquez, LA DPW BOS
Lianne McGinley, City of Burbank DWP
John Pearson, City of Glendale

Augustine Rios
Dan Sharp, LACo DPW/FCD
Youn Sim, LACo DPW
Paula Sirola, Arroyo Seco Foundation
Larry Smith, North East Trees
Nancy Steele, LASGRWC
Marc Stirdivant, City of Glendale
Melanie Winter, The River Project

| Topic/Issue | Discussion | Action/Follow up |
|---|--|---|
| 1. Introductions | Tom Erb opened the meeting at 8:12 am with introductions. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action |
| 2. Approve 05/02/07 Meeting Minutes | The minutes from the 05/02/07 meeting were distributed. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting minutes were approved. |
| 3. Update on Leadership Committee a. IRWM Program News b. Decision Making Structure c. Next Phase of Consultant Assistance | <p>The agenda for the next Leadership Committee Meeting was distributed to the Steering Committee. Several items were discussed:</p> <p>IRWM Program News</p> <p>A letter to Director Snow has been drafted to inform about the ongoing meetings for the LA-Ventura funding area and suggest a potential methodology for a IRWM funding split.</p> <p>At the last Steering Committee meeting, a motion was passed to recommend merger of the Upper Santa Clara and Ventura regions. Although a merger is possible, but no one was actively encouraging or discouraging the merger at this time. It was also noted that Upper Santa Clara was probably not going after Round 2</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Steering Committee passed motions (with the County abstaining) regarding the Decision Making Structure on the order of preference of the options: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Option 3 2. Option 2 3. Option 1 • Leadership Committee terms should be staggered to maintain continuity • Water Management Area representatives should represent the entire region • Suggest changing the name of the Leadership Committee to Regional Coordinating Committee |

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

| Topic/Issue | Discussion | Action/Follow up |
|-------------|--|------------------|
| | <p>Prop 50 funding.</p> <p>Decision Making Structure</p> <p>Mario Acevedo distributed a summary of three options for selection of water management area representatives on the Leadership Committee and asked for discussion, to provide Tom Erb with guidance for the next Leadership Committee meeting.</p> <p><u>Option 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Leadership Committee Expanded to 16 members o Two Representatives appointed by each subregion o Los Angeles County to remain as Chair of the Leadership Committee o One Water Management Strategy appointed by each subregion o Water Management selection must meet minimum qualifications <p><u>Option 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Leadership Committee Expanded to 16 members o Two Representatives appointed by each subregion o Los Angeles County to remain as Chair of the Leadership Committee o One Water Management Strategy appointed by each subregion o All Water Management selections must be approved by the initial 11 members of the Leadership Committee <p><u>Option 3</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Leadership Committee Expanded to 16 members | |

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

| Topic/Issue | Discussion | Action/Follow up |
|-------------|---|------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Two Representatives appointed by each subregion ○ Los Angeles County to remain as Chair of the Leadership Committee ○ One Water Management Strategy appointed by each subregion ○ All Water Management selections must be appointed by the initial 11 members of the Leadership Committee <p>The discussion focused on the appropriate selection process for the Water Management Focus Areas. Concern was expressed that they should represent a regional view and not just a subregion. If selection was left to the subregion, it could create a 3-vote block focused on the subregion's interests. Nominations should come from the subregions to form an initial pool of Water Management Area representatives. It was suggested that the Water Management Areas reps could meet separately to maintain their independence from one subregion and represent a regional view.</p> <p>It was suggested that the Leadership Committee terms should be staggered to provide continuity on the Leadership Committee rather than turning over all 16 seats every 3 years.</p> <p>Concerns about control of the project selection process were noted. Options included: selection by ex-officio (non-voting) members, selection by an independent third-party, selection by the Steering Committees (e.g., based on an identified funding amount), or asking Leadership Committee members to recuse themselves if their agency had a project</p> | |

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

| Topic/Issue | Discussion | Action/Follow up |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>on the list.</p> <p>Next Phase of Consultant Assistance</p> <p>How to move forward with the process, given the pending expiration of the consultant contract, was discussed. Concern was expressed about how the issue could have remain unresolved for so long. The lack of available funds, the unresolved governance issues, and the cost share among agencies and subregions were noted as factors. It was suggested that funding requests to agencies should be matched with budget cycles.</p> <p>It was suggested that a structure for ongoing support was needed, instead of focusing on individual phases. A 3rd party should be considered to manage and coordinate the process. It was suggested that the County should have the largest funding responsibility for the long term, but it was noted that could imply the County has all the power.</p> | |
| <p>4. Project Prioritization</p> <p>a. Review Initial Results</p> <p>b. Consider Identification of Subregional Criteria</p> <p>c. Consider Candidate Projects for Integration Exercise</p> | <p>Mark Horne briefed the Steering Committee on the development of the database and the history of the submitting projects via the Long Form, Short Form and a Spreadsheet. The intent of the exercise was to make a trial run of the draft prioritization framework and determine the next steps in moving forward to further develop the prioritization framework. The results of the prioritization exercise were discussed, which was influenced by the limited information for many projects, and the absence of regional weighting factors.</p> <p>The need to validate the information in the database was noted, to remove duplicate and</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tom Erb will draft a proposal for the Steering Committee recommending next steps for the project prioritization and integration process. |

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

| Topic/Issue | Discussion | Action/Follow up |
|---|--|---|
| | <p>completed projects. In addition the categories identified for project readiness include construction start, which is not appropriate for land acquisition and education projects. It was suggested that proponents be given additional time to update the information in the database and then re-score the updated projects. It was also suggested that the framework should remain based on local priorities, and should not be modified to fit upcoming (Prop 84) grant criteria.</p> <p>Some discussion occurred on the potential to rank the objectives and award bonus points for specific strategies or project types, but no consensus emerged for either concept.</p> <p>It was noted that given the timeline for the next grant application (which may not be due until next spring), there was no great rush to finalize the list or proceed with the integration exercise.</p> <p>It was suggested that scoring of projects should be reviewed to eliminate any errors in scoring. It was suggested that other factors, like project cost, site ownership, technical correctness and integration opportunities also need to be considered.</p> <p>It was proposed that Tom Erb develop a proposal for how to proceed that will be forwarded to the committee for consideration.</p> | |
| <p>5. Schedule for Future Meetings</p> | <p>Next Steering Committee Meeting: TBA</p> <p>Next Leadership Committee meeting on June 7, 2007 at 8:00, at LA County DPW, Alhambra.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mario Acevedo will notify the Steering Committee on the time and location of the next Steering Committee Meeting. |

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