

**Greater Los Angeles Integrated Regional Water Management Plan
South Bay Steering Committee
November 13, 2007
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm
West Basin MWD**

Meeting Notes -- DRAFT

Present:

Sharon Green
Jackie Bacarach
Scott Delinger
Terri Grant
Jason Weeks

Tom West
Rob Beste
Kathleen McGowan
Paul Herzog
Andree Hunt

Frank Kuo

Agenda Item	Topic/ Issue	Discussion	Action Item/Follow Up
1	Welcome, Introductions	Rich led the introductions.	
2	Review/approve October 9 Steering Committee Meeting Notes	<p>Paul Herzog mentioned his comments that he emailed out on November 8. A key issue Paul brought up was about per capita allocation. Paul noted his comments (emailed out) applied to AB31 which dealt with Chapter 9 of Prop. 84, not Chapter 2 through which the IRWMP program will be funded.</p> <p>No comments were provided specifically on the October 9 meeting notes.</p>	Email comments to Tom West and Leighanne.
3	Nov. 1 Leadership Committee meeting review	<p>a. Rich commented about the funding area discussion and about progress on how Prop. 84 IRWM implementation dollars may be split between LA County, Ventura County and the Upper Santa Clara regions. Rich described the Leadership Committee's position on split with Ventura County. Currently LA County staff is finalizing a letter and hope to send it out shortly. Rich indicated that the proposed model of base + population will provide LA most funds. Sharon noted that with delays in Prop. 84 appropriations, there seems little incentive to try and reach some middle ground now. Sharon also noted that the Upper Santa Clara involved too. Frank noted that agriculture water needs in Ventura County complicate developing any type of formula.</p> <p>b. The Leadership Committee proposed writing letters to all state legislators in the LA region asking to push to get Prop. 84 funds appropriated as soon as possible. Jackie asked to have the letter sent to her so that the various COGs can write their own letters.</p>	<p>Tom to forward county letter to legislators to Jackie and COGs.</p> <p>Email letters letters intended for legislators to steering committee members once they are available from LA County staff..</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.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. Discussion on leadership committee new members: Rich listed names of WMA's reps and their alternates. d. Discussed formation of the Gateway Cities JPA. Rich noted that questions are being asked about the real purpose of this JPA. It was noted that the JPA is confusing because some Leadership Committee members are also in the JPA. Sharon shared the discussion that was held at the last LLASG steering committee meeting. She said that they did talk about what the purpose will be. In general, concern is that parties in the JPA shouldn't be trying to play both sides of fence when it comes to accessing IRWM program dollars. The Leadership Committee agreed to send a letter to Lester Snow to get clarity on competing regions in light of being encouraged to consolidate. Frank mentioned that other regions in State are dealing with issue of entities breaking away. Frank commented that uncertainty created by breakaway regions may delay Prop. 84 funding area disbursement. e. Discussed possibly drafting some legislation to address the issue of what constitutes a qualifying region. It was noted that the Leadership Committee is having difficulty mobilizing on this front because some members of the Leadership Committee are not in favor of this. f. Paul Herzog commented that Green LA is having similar issue on NorCal vs. So. Calif. funding share from Prop. 84 funding. g. Rich clarified that there are actually two letters being prepared for legislators: one on Prop. 84 funds and another on future bond measures. Once drafted, letters will be sent out to the steering committee for their information. h. Rob Beste asked why the Leadership Committee hasn't taken a position on excluding Gateway Cities. It was noted that the Upper LA subregion has suggested including wording in the MOU to establish exclusivity. i. Paul suggested having Shelley Luce step up to call the Gateway JPA into question. No formal action item was established. j. The Steering Committee closed out the discussion by agreeing not to recommend any particular action at this time but continue tracking and reporting back. 	
4	MOU Discussion	<p>Rich introduced the MOU discussion and indicated that he hopes to have MOU resolved and signed in next 3-6 months.</p> <p>Andree then walked the steering committee through the current working draft of the MOU.</p>	Steering Committee members to email comments on MOU to Rich Nagel.

		<p>A key question discussed was who signs the MOU:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Rich proposed one MOU for the Leadership Committee and another MOU for Steering Committee. He was concerned about the time it would take to involve all parties and get them to sign off. ○ Do we want to include some teeth? We need to clarify about who can sign on. ○ There should be a separate resolution of support from entities that aren't part of either the Leadership Committee or steering committees. ○ If an entity signs on to the MOU, does that bring up quorum issues? ○ There was concern that if the number of signatories wasn't limited to just the Leadership Committee, that they will never be able to amend the MOU if desired. ○ MOU should be worded such that a new MOU doesn't have to be prepared every time a seat on the Leadership Committee turns over. ○ MOU and operating guidelines should need to refer to steering committees. ○ Discussed executive level status – MOU should have language saying involvement “should” be at the executive level ○ Funding contribution language—there was discussion about developing a standardized fee structure for each sub-region. <p>Steering committee members were asked to email comments to Rich. Chairs of steering committees are getting together week after Thanksgiving to finalize—the revised MOU will presented to Leadership Committee at the December meeting. The hope is then that the MOU will be finalized and everyone signs on in January.</p>	
5	Funding Contributions	<p>Each subregion is sending out letters to cities requesting contributions. There was discussion about the merits of doing this. There was general agreement that the Steering Committees probably should not be asking for contributions without describing a clear benefit to the cities.</p> <p>With regard to the scope of work for the next phase, Paul commented that there is not a clear planning process in place to develop a comprehensive set of projects to solve problems. Rich commented that further integration will be taking place throughout the next phase and a more comprehensive set of</p>	

		solutions will begin to evolve.	
6	Outreach to Cities and other Parties	<p>Frank reported that the County was tasked with conducting greater outreach to cities and that the County has city services staff to interact with cities. Frank noted that many of the cities in the Region have active projects with the County. As such, the County is considering different strategies to improve outreach including more one-on-one discussions.</p> <p>There was a suggestion about giving presentations to the South Bay and Westside COGs. It was suggested that a handout be distributed along with a presentation to the COG's infrastructure task force. Jackie noted the need to get to City managers engaged.</p> <p>Paul commented that he hasn't seen any presentations about the LA IRWMP effort. Frank noted that County has some powerpoints. Frank also noted that the current consultant contract is being revised to provide a summary of where we have been and where we are going. Frank noted that the Upper San Gabriel subregion wants to prepare their own presentation for their subregion.</p>	<p>Rich and County to coordinate presentations to the COGs Work with Jackie to set up with the South Bay COG.</p> <p>Rich to work with County on preparing presentation information and materials.</p>
7	Presentation by Project Proponents on Integration Opportunities	There was not sufficient time for presentations from West Basin and WRD. These will be provided at the next meeting.	<p>Email to Leighanne and Tom West projects to be presented at future meetings.</p> <p>West Basin and WRD to present at the next steering committee meeting.</p>
8	Future Agenda Items/Other Items	No additional items were proposed for future agendas	Email any proposed agenda items to Leighanne.
9	Next Meetings	<p>Leadership Committee December 6, 9:30 am at LA County DPW</p> <p>South Bay Steering Committee December 11, 2007, 2 pm to 4 pm West Basin MWD</p>	Please confirm your attendance at the next SC meeting with Leighanne.