

Draft Minutes
USG&RHR Steering Committee
September 12, 2006
9:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
San Gabriel Valley Water Quality Authority

Attendees:

Shirley Birosik
Denis Hernandez
Aracely Lasso
Susan Bremer
Pat Malloy
Thom Coffey
Darin Kasamoto
J. R. Rarells
Frank Kuo
Randy Schoellerman
Jeff Helsley
Tony Zampielo
Wally Weaver
Carol Williams
Steve Johnson
Jane Busly
Jane Bray
Terri Grant
Ed Means
Nina Jazmadarian

The Project Integration TM, Benefits and Costs TM and Implementation TM were reviewed.

The following comments were made from committee members and stakeholders regarding contents from the TMs:

1. On slides 5, 6, 7 and 8, summary of projects by various categories, the tables should be changed to include all projects. If the project, when submitted, did not include all of the information, a column should be added saying information unknown. Total at bottom right should be the same in all cases.
2. On slide 5 there are notations describing open space and other benefits and on slide 6 there is a notation describing open space. Both slides should have notations describing what is included in water supply and water quality and that drinking water quality is included in water supply not water quality.

3. In the future, there should be an analysis of the submitted projects to identify those projects that have multiple benefits which have currently shown only one benefit.
4. For Planning Tool 1, explain why although BMPs implemented on a site scale, water supply does not increase as a result. (Slides 10 and 11)
5. On slide 12, breakdown costs by detail.
6. On slide 12, include units for dollar amounts. *Benefits TM included units on table headings.*
7. On slide 12, note that this only includes costs and yield based on new facilities being constructed not public outreach which could have a significant impact on dry weather runoff.
8. A question was raised as to how runoff from pristine areas was separated from urban runoff using Planning Tool 3. The answer was that the facilities are not built on the river but a main stem of the storm system to the river.
9. On slide 15, for the water supply dollars, explain the methodology of how numbers were determined and what the flaws are with this method.
10. On slide 25, pro-rating riparian habitat by population is not appropriate.
11. In the IRWMP, as part of the implementation strategy, list development of subregional targets as a “to do” item.
12. The tables on slides 36-38 will not be included in the IRWMP.
13. Local funding should show a range as reflected on the table in slide 40.
14. There should be more outreach to the cities to obtain further involvement as we move forward.
15. One of the items to start discussing is how projects should be submitted for the next round of funding to occur likely in spring of 2007.
16. There should be an examination of opportunities for cross-subregional projects.
17. For the time-being, the current Leadership Committee governance structure should be kept but as a “to-do” this structure should be examined in the near term.
18. Processes to establish responsibilities should be set up as we move forward.
19. Need to work targets and other items bottom-up not top-down. There needs to be a reconciliation of the numbers by subregion.
20. On slide 50, “ID need for state or federal approval or assistance on existing projects” should be moved to long-term.
21. On slide 51, “Establish Subregional funding priorities” should be moved to immediate.
22. Slide 52, specific funding outside of Proposition 50 should be removed. Funding should be discussed generically.

Schedule

October 1, 2006 – Administrative Draft Released for Public Review,
comments due within three weeks

October 19, 2006 – next USG&RHR Steering Committee and Stakeholders
meeting, 1:30 p.m. at San Gabriel Basin Water Quality Authority

October 25, 2006 – Regional Workshop, place to be determined

December 13, 2006 – adoption of LA IRWMP

Carol Williams