

IRWMP Leadership Committee

Greater Los Angeles Integrated Regional Water Management Plan
 March 25, 2009, 9:30 a.m. to 12 p.m.
 Los Angeles County Flood Control District
 12th Floor Executive Conference Room

Present:

Siya Araumi, LACFCD
 John Biggs, Brown and Caldwell
 Hector Bordas, LACFCD
 Barbara Cameron, City of Malibu
 Grace Chan, MWDCS
 Donna Chen, City of Los Angeles, BOS
 George De La O, LACFCD
 Ed Demesa, Corps of Engineers
 Jan Dougall, Las Virgenes MWD
 Tracy Egoscue, Regional Board
 Tom Erb, LADWP

Belinda Faustinos, RMC
 Norma Garcia, LA County Recreation and
 Parks
 Sharon Green, LACSD
 Kenneth Hu, LA County DPW
 Grace Kast, San Gabriel Basin WQA
 Burt Kumagawa, LA County CEO
 Wendy La, Main San Gabriel Basin
 Watermaster
 Rich Nagel, West Basin MWD
 Sherwood Natsuhara, City of Vernon

Andy Niknafs, LADWP
 Randal Orton, Las Virgenes MWD
 Melih Ozbilgin, Brown and Caldwell
 Mark Pestrella, LACFCD
 Nancy Steele, LASGRWC
 Mark Stuart, Department of Water
 Resources
 Theresa Wu, Water Replenishment District
 Tony Zampielo, Raymond Basin
 Mary Zauner, LACSD

Topic/Issue	Discussion	Action/Follow up
1. Welcome, Introductions and Purpose	Hector Bordas opened the meeting at 9:42 a.m. with introductions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action
2. Approval Meeting Summary from February 25, 2008	Minutes were distributed to the Leadership Committee for review and comment. Minutes were approved unanimously.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes approved
3. Public Comment Period	No Comments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action
4. IRWM Program News	<p>Region Acceptance Process Guidelines have been released and Application being developed. Final decision on Region Acceptance expected in August or September.</p> <p>Proposition 50 Project sponsor invoices have been sent to the Fiscal Division for preparation of the invoice to the State for four Prop 50 funded projects. The system will be accepting information for additional projects for our second invoice to be prepared.</p> <p>State Bond Sales State sold \$3bn in bonds as of Tuesday. However the freeze would have to be removed to spend money. Once the freeze is removed the money will be spent according to the following priority:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frozen projects prior to December 17th 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nancy Steele will forward fact sheet, terms, and draft contract on private placement bonds to interested parties.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priority Projects • Existing Projects • New Projects <p>Treasurer does not expect new grants to roll out before 2010</p> <p>Alternative Funding Sources Discussion occurred on alternative bond funding mechanisms, specifically the private placement of bonds. Noted that this presents an opportunity to get projects moving in the current environment. First step is getting a list of bonds and shopping around, noting that there will be no sale less than \$5m. The project proponent(s) would negotiate directly with the qualified investor. Further the buyer of the bond designates where the money goes so it can be targeted at specific projects. It was also noted that only projects currently held up can qualify.</p>	
<p>5. Steering Committee Chair Reports</p> <p>a. Disadvantaged Community Outreach</p> <p>b. Planning Needs / Project Prioritization / Workshop</p>	<p>Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers The Steering Committee met in March and discussed the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewed composition of the Steering Committee • Gateway Cities Membership and Representatives • Disadvantaged Community Outreach – moving ahead and working on outreach • Application of Project Selection Criteria – fact checking and reaffirming database • Discussed General Projects and DAC Projects <p>North Santa Monica Bay The Steering Committee met in March and discussed the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation on County Funding Initiative – had concerns over fate of money • Worked on Project Prioritization based on readiness to proceed • Approved sending questionnaire to project proponents and added language on minimum funding required. • Lynn Rodriguez from Ventura attended the meeting to discuss trans-regional projects • Looking at identifying projects to move forward that do not need other grant funding. <p>South Bay The Steering Committee met in March and discussed the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussed grant funding • Worked on project prioritization specifically verifying information and working 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action

	<p>towards 10 – 15 viable projects.</p> <p>Upper Los Angeles River The Steering Committee met in March and discussed the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had grant funding presentation • Worked on Project Prioritization to round out top 20 projects • Reworking Top 20 projects into 3 categories: General, DAC, Water Conservation • Reviewed project readiness • Committee approved of concept behind project selection criteria but had concerns about funding allocations <p>Upper San Gabriel and Rio Hondo Rivers The Steering Committee met in March and discussed the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewed Project Priority List • Conducted project presentations to improve data • Reviewed project readiness • Presentation on County Funding Initiative • Discussed project selection criteria, approved of the concept, but were not comfortable with the division of funds. Want a bottom up approach for project selection. Suggested 10% of the funding for DAC projects and 90% for subregional projects. 	
<p>6. Project Selection Criteria and Funding</p>	<p>Nancy Steele reviewed the Project Selection Criteria Strawman and recommendations. As part of the review a discussion took place covering the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilizing existing prioritization framework and adjusting the weighting once the guidelines are out. • Projects can be combined to add up to be regional in benefits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Regional Project Ad Hoc Committee looking at projects identified as Regional in database • The guidelines should be more generic and then adapted to guidelines for funding. • Should not limit application to 10 projects, noted that 10 was an estimate for the purpose of estimating scope and budget. Request made to look at alternatives to fit resources to projects. • Looking for good information to develop suite of projects. • Should have project presentations to the Leadership Committee at a meeting or workshop to better vet projects and have a transparent process. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Steering Committee Chairs should be able to speak about projects from 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership Committee requested that the consultant advise the Leadership Committee on what can be done to expand the number of projects in the application and keep the existing budget. • Agendize discussion on funding allocation and sustainable funding model. • Ad Hoc Committee will update Strawman.

	<p>their subregion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to agendize future discussion on funding allocation and sustainable funding model. <p>Ad Hoc Committee will finalize Strawman for Leadership Committee and allow for the review by the Steering Committee.</p>	
<p>7. Grant Ad Hoc Committee(s) Status</p> <p>a. Water Conservation b. Disadvantaged Community c. Regional Projects</p>	<p>Disadvantaged Community</p> <p>The Ad Hoc Committee met and discussed the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How are guidelines being developed for DACs? • Need to gather DAC project lists from subregions • Get guidance from State on DAC projects and outreach • Review region maps with DACs and projects identified • Brief the Leadership Committee on status and findings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action
<p>8. 2008 Consultant Activities</p> <p>a. Planning Needs / Project Prioritization b. Disadvantaged Community Involvement c. Region Acceptance Process – Budget Contract Changes</p>	<p>Melih Ozbilgin updated the Leadership Committee on the status of Consultant activities specifically highlighting the following activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalizing project selection criteria • Working on new project database • Supporting Belinda Faustinos with the DAC Outreach and Project Selection efforts • Working with the County on the RAP – Schedule for RAP Process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action
<p>9. RAP Application Process</p> <p>a. RAP Application Review Team b. RAP Application Interview Team</p>	<p>RAP Budget</p> <p>Motion made and passed unanimously to approve the budget adjustment proposed to the Leadership Committee to allocate money from the IRWMP Update to cover the development of the RAP Application.</p> <p>RAP Application Submission</p> <p>Motion made and passed unanimously to delegate authority to Los Angeles County Flood Control District to submit RAP Application to DWR.</p> <p>RAP Application Process</p> <p>Need team to review the application from each Steering Committee, the following people volunteered to review the application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Belinda Faustinos • Leighanne Reeser • Andy Niknafs • Randal Orton • Wendy La • Mary Zauner • George De La O 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Siya Araumi will follow up with review panel on schedule.

	<p>The anticipated schedule for the RAP Application is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • April 2nd (Webcast) and April 8th (at MWD) are DWR workshops on RAP. • Draft RAP Application due from Consulting Team on March 31 • April 16th meeting with review panel to go over RAP comments <p>It was also noted that the Leadership Committee needs to determine who will attend the interview to provide the best knowledge and appearance for the interview panel. Questions were also raised on the coordination with Ventura and Orange Counties. It was also asked if it would be worthwhile for Ventura County to write a letter about comfort with existing boundaries.</p>	
10. Legislative Update	<p>Rich Nagel distributed a handout on current Water Bond Proposals and gave the Leadership Committee an update on going legislation in the State which covered the following bills and updates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to include IRWM funds in Water Bond (Bond targeted for November 2010). • Water use efficiency is moving forward, need to work on coordinated effort. • AB110 -> Allow demonstration for super-advanced treated wastewater to be bottled and used for education. • AB410 -> Utilize unallocated funds from Prop 50 for Salt and Nutrient Plans. • AB139 -> Allow collection of property related fee. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action
11. Water Quality Funding Initiative – Status, Findings and Direction	<p>Hector Bordas briefed the Leadership Committee on the Water Quality Funding Initiative. He is currently working on presenting the Initiative to all Steering Committees on the Initiative as well as Cities in the area. An informational packet was passed out for the Leadership Committee members. It was requested that parties support AB139 which will allow for the fee to be accessed as part of the initiative.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action
12. Future Agenda Items / Other Items	<p>Regional Board</p> <p>Tracy Egoscue held a question and answer session with the Leadership Committee regarding the Regional Board, specifically relating to the Recycled Water Policy and Basin Plans that covered the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recycled Water Policy & Regional Board <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Recycled Water for construction, dust mitigation, & landscaping ○ Montebello forebay recycled water increase ○ Moving to clear hurdles and working to get in place procedures to become self reliant ○ Willing and able to help with recycled water at Regional Board level ○ Permits will look like the permits given to City of LA ○ Health Department Permits has been helpful on recycled water issues and efficient on Title 22 Plans. ○ Does the policy cover grey water? -> No <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ MWD has work group on grey water, typically it is 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggested that letters be written to De La Torre in support of allocating Prop 50 funds for salt and nutrient plans.

	<p>addressed in building code.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Legislation to have State Board look at direct reuse <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ May be better to have a local approach to the direct reuse. ● Salt Management Plan(s) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Started in San Fernando Basin ○ Want agencies to get started early ○ Due 5 years from February 3rd ○ Need to start conversation on plans with Regional Board ○ Salt Plans apply to irrigation as well ○ Need to acknowledge differences in subregions when working with local agencies to develop salt plans. ● Tri-annual Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Typically staff of Regional Board would provide priorities ○ This time comments will be taken and the priorities in those comments will be ranked. Then the 3 priorities will be set form the public and staff recommendations. ○ Will be funded from general fund. ○ There is ongoing litigation over tri-annual review that is on appeal ● NPDES Permit <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LA County has NPDES Stormwater Permit, but there are requests from 6 cities for individual permits. ○ MS4 permit to include TMDL ○ Need to file ROWD. <p>Regional Project Discussion Requested further discussion on Regional Projects, specifically asked if the Regional Projects Ad Hoc Committee could provide a strawman on the categorization and definition of Regional Projects.</p> <p>Annenberg Foundation Foundation has recently gone through a reorganization and there will be nothing in the near future.</p>	
13. Meeting Adjournment	Meeting Adjourned at 11:53 a.m.	● No Action
14. Next Meeting:	LA IRWMP Leadership Committee: Los Angeles County Public Works, Wednesday, April 22, 2009, 9:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.	

WEST BASIN MWD

2009 Water Bond Proposals

AB 1187 (Huffman and Caballero) -- Total: \$10 billion

- Chapter 6: Water Supply Reliability: \$2 billion
- Chapter 7: Delta Sustainability: \$ 1.9 billion
- Chapter 8: Water Storage: \$3 billion (upon appropriation of the Legislature)
- Chapter 9: Conservation and Watershed Protection: \$1.6 billion
- Chapter 10: Groundwater Protection and Water Quality: \$1.1 billion
- Chapter 11: Water Recycling: \$500 million
- Chapter 12: Statewide Water Fee: Fee to be imposed on water users to pay for principal and interest on bonds. Amount undetermined.

SB 301 (Florez) -- Total: \$15 billion

Note: Based on the Feinstein-Schwarzenegger 2008 Proposal

- Chapter 6: Water Supply Reliability: \$2.5 billion
- Chapter 7: Delta Sustainability and Conveyance: \$2 billion
- Chapter 8: Water Storage: \$7 billion (continuous appropriation)
- Chapter 9: Ecosystem Recovery and Restoration: \$2.5 billion
- Chapter 10: Groundwater Protection and Water Quality: \$800 million
- Chapter 11: Water Recycling: \$200 million

SB 371 (Cogdill) -- Total: \$9.98 billion

Note: Based primarily on AB9XX (Plescia) of 2008

- Chapter 6: Water Supply Reliability: \$2.1 billion
- Chapter 7: Delta Sustainability: \$ 1.9 billion
- Chapter 8: Water Storage: \$ 3 billion (continuous appropriation)
- Chapter 9: Conservation and Watershed Protection: \$1.4 billion
- Chapter 10: Groundwater Protection and Water Quality: \$1 billion
- Chapter 11: Water Recycling: \$500 million
- Chapter 12: Water Use Efficiency Program: \$20 million (for direct expenditures to fund water savings projects of state agencies and departments at state buildings and facilities.)

SB 456 (Wolk) -- Total: \$9.8 billion

- Chapter 6: Water Supply Reliability: \$2 billion
- Chapter 7: Delta Sustainability: \$1.9 billion
- Chapter 8: Water Storage: \$3 billion (continuous appropriation)
- Chapter 9: Conservation and Watershed Protection: \$1.3 billion
- Chapter 10: Groundwater Protection and Water Quality: \$1 billion
- Chapter 11: Water Recycling: \$500 million
- Chapter 12: Water Use Efficiency Program: \$20 million (for direct expenditures to fund water savings projects of state agencies and departments at state buildings and facilities.)

SB 565 (Pavley)

Water Recycling. As drafted this bill would require the state board to develop a plan to ensure that at least 50% of wastewater that is annually discharged into the ocean, as of the year 2009, is recycled and put to beneficial use by the year 2030. The bill would assess a fee on all entities that discharge wastewater into the ocean.

SB 735 (Steinberg) – Total: \$9.8 billion

- Chapter 6: Water Supply Reliability: \$2 billion
- Chapter 7: Delta Sustainability: \$1.9 billion
- Chapter 8: Water Storage: \$3 billion (upon appropriation of the Legislature)
- Chapter 9: Conservation and Watershed Protection: \$1.3 billion
- Chapter 10: Groundwater Protection and Water Quality: \$1 billion
- Chapter 11: Water Recycling: \$500 million
- Chapter 12: California Water Resource Fund: fee to be imposed on residential, commercial, industrial and agricultural water users. Amount undetermined

Water Use Efficiency: 20% Reduction Legislation

- AB 49, Assembly Members Feuer and Huffman: Conservation, 20% reduction (Spot Bill, sponsored by NRDC)
- SB 261, Senators Ducheny and Dutton: Conservation, 20% reduction (Spot Bill, sponsored by SAWPA)
- SB 460, Senator Wolk, 20% reduction (Spot Bill, sponsored by ACWA and Solano County Water Department)