

IRWMP Leadership Committee

Greater Los Angeles Integrated Regional Water Management Plan
 May 27, 2009 9:30 a.m. to 11:35 a.m.
 Los Angeles County Flood Control District
 12th Floor Executive Conference Room

Present:

Siya Araumi, LACFCD
 Rob Beste, Water Replenishment District
 John Biggs, Brown and Caldwell
 Barbara Cameron, City of Malibu
 Grace Chan, MWDSC
 Donna Chen, City of Los Angeles, BOS
 George De La O, LACFCD
 Kathi Delegal, LA County Public Works
 Shannon DeLong, City of Downey
 Jan Dougall, Las Virgenes MWD
 Tom Erb, LADWP
 Belinda Faustinos, RMC

Norma Garcia, Los Angeles County
 Department of Parks and Recreation
 Sharon Green, LACSD
 Mark Horne, PBS&J
 Grace Kast, San Gabriel Basin WQA
 Wendy La, Main San Gabriel Basin
 Watermaster
 Mina Mitri, LACFCD
 Rich Nagel, West Basin MWD
 Andy Niknafs, LADWP
 Randal Orton, Las Virgenes MWD
 Melih Ozbilgin, Brown and Caldwell

Leighanne Reeser, West Basin MWD
 Randy Schollerman, San Gabriel Basin
 WQA
 Nancy Steele, LASGRWC
 Scott Valor, SMBRC
 Tom West, RMC
 Carol Williams, Main San Gabriel Basin
 Watermaster
 Theresa Wu, Water Replenishment District
 Tony Zampielo, Raymond Basin
 Mary Zauner, LACSD

Topic/Issue	Discussion	Action/Follow up
1. Welcome, Introductions and Purpose	Mark Pestrella opened the meeting at 9:42 a.m. with introductions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action
2. Approval Meeting Summary from April 22, 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 Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action
4. Region Acceptance Process <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Composition of Interview Team b. Goal(s) of Interview and Strategies c. Selection of a Spokesperson d. Development of a 10-minute Opening Statement e. Interview Questions and Answers 	Tom West led a discussion on the upcoming Region Acceptance Process Interview covering the following points: Composition of the interview team <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each subregion would have a rep, FCD as chair, two open spots depending on questions asked. • North Santa Monica Bay – Joe Bellemo (Randal's Designee) • South Bay – Rich Nagel • Upper Los Angeles River – Tom Erb • Upper San Gabriel and Rio Hondo Rivers – Carol Williams • Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers – Possibly Art Aguilar, Belinda Faustinos will confirm. • Leadership Committee Chair – Diego Cadena and Mark Pestrella 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interview Preparation Meeting on June 10th at 9:00 a.m.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f. Who Should Answer Questions g. Leave Behind and Graphics for Interview h. Other Non-interview Attendees i. Pre-meet Prior to Interview j. Other 	<p><i>Interview Schedule & Panel</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gateway Cities IRWM interview will follow Greater Los Angeles IRWM interview. • DWR may bring the two groups together afterward for additional questions/meetings—try to get some regional solution (i.e. “why aren’t you a single group?”) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This is not the only such occurrence within the state. There is overlap up and down the state. We are near the end (i.e. other groups in the state will be meeting 1-2 weeks before us; San Diego follows). • John Woodling (Sacramento Regional Water Authority—no longer with DWR)—says he’ll be sitting on all panels. • DWR staff: DWR, state & or regional board reps, up to 5 people, but not clear who. Staff, not board members, due to expertise issues. • Interview process, per state: 1.5-2.0 hours. 10 minute presentation; DWR provides questions (maybe only a few days ahead of time) and will presumably ask the questions and the panel will discuss. <p><i>What does this IRWMP want to get out of the process?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Show that we have good targets for each of the areas req’d by IRWMP process. • Regional coordination and cooperation going on (which is unprecedented at this point)—be sure to emphasize that (breadth, diversity of groups); • Participants need to read Gateway proposal and be prepared to make arguments addressing their issues (i.e. “we’re not meeting their needs”—show that we can/are doing so); • Consider acknowledging any shortcomings; • Give examples of projects or processes that are not dependent on funding; • Show leveraging beyond state funding; • Do visual presentation—targeted goals, balanced governance, diversity, integrated system, inclusivity, breadth of perspective w/ water management areas; show alignment b/w state’s water plan and our plan; • Show how we leverage their money (just as SMBRC does on the federal level); • Note that we brought a lot of money to supplement the state’s planning money; 	
--	--	--

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"> • Not “pay to play”—even small/non contributors have a seat at the table; • Show nonprofit participation at the subregional level • Balance where we’re going with what we already did to reach out, etc.—let them dispute that we did an amazing job—don’t go in with an inferiority complex • Flexibility in the governance • What happens to us if they gave Gateway its own IRWMP—what would be our response? Do we stick this out? <p>What do we want to avoid?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If Gateway allowed to occur, might lead to break up of the greater region—potential disintegration of it. Emphasizing that we came from subregions and were asked to come together and the region did. Gateway separation would be regressive. • Disintegration means more competition for money means more paperwork for state agencies. <p>Other Items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is DWR looking for? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ After first interview, interview information should be “public” information. ○ Confer with Roundtable of Regions. • Why did state push the integration (into the larger group)? How does that fit into DWR’s vision for this? Who is in line for this? • Focus on emphasizing the goals of our plan. Going back to fundamentals—does what we say verbally match our plans/goals. Greater LA IRWM decided on certain regional goals and here is the road map to make that happen. • How is the Greater LA IRWMP monitoring progress toward those goals. <p>Potential DWR’s issues/questions?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is the planning level appropriate for this region? • Why is this the best approach for planning in this region? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Given the size of the region and the interconnectedness, it is necessary. ○ At the same time, implementation is on a very local level. ○ Cannot get away from the marriage of those two. ○ Due to our sprawl (no central municipality), transportation and economy drive a regional approach. Broken out by watershed, we still saw a need for regional approach throughout the watersheds. 	
--	--	--

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

	<p>Master planning for habitat, etc. as well, is regional. Stretching local and federal money—leveraging—is done well. We should be able to demonstrate this thoroughly—money well spent in this region.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disadvantaged Communities Outreach—how many projects address this? • How do we resolve conflict? Does the IRWMP resolve the issues? Address them—mutually beneficial solutions? This large regional approach is a good forum to address those conflicts—creates a knowledge base that otherwise wouldn't be available on a smaller regional/subregional level. • Prioritization—how are you prioritizing? At a subregional level (addresses a Gateway issue). How do you establish general priorities? • How do we track progress/goals, and how does that affect our planning process? • Absent state funding at this point, how do we continue to make this process survive? • Show cooperation with other regions (ex: Ventura & OC) because hydrological boundaries extend beyond these regions. Example—how we are addressing the salt and nutrient management plans, as a statewide policy that needs to be addressed. Also recycled water policy— must be able to show how we are addressing it. • Put together chronology of trying to bring Gateway back into the fold—show attempted outreach. Many entities in Gateway are playing it both ways. There is continued representation from them here and they have an opportunity to participate for funding. • Show that we transitioned our plan from the Prop 50 goals to the differing Prop 84 goals. We derive our regional plan from local needs. Drought is an interdependent, regional problem (for example). <p>What does DWR want?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Credibility for their program • Ammunition for bringing the groups back together & approve region boundaries • Looking for ways to “punish” bad regions? Leverage against those regions operating inappropriately (exclusionary, for example). • Integrated Management is the new model—not just state, but local, integrated management: which asks whether our model is inclusive enough. Need to be able to show that. Show that under Prop 84, bar has been raised, and we have responded to that. <p>Ten-Minute Opening Statement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Want to come in with a positive message about region working together. 	
--	---	--

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"> • Need to anticipate the 3-4 key DWR issues in that statement, state how we address them, our vision, repeat them at the end—who we are, what is our approach, how are we addressing the issues. • ONE presenter for opening, demonstrating our philosophy is consistent with theirs. Also concentrate on ENDING statement—be able to make a statement that reiterates our responses to their issues. • Other participants—every one there has a role & appropriate message to carry. Why does this system work for them, why is it the best for that region. • FCD chair (or designee) • Chair or vice-chair of subregions • Two FCD selections from Water Mgmt. areas—county should make determination. Habitat/open space is acknowledged as a gap that needs to be addressed. Mark Pestrella will confirm this in an email. • Much depends on who is available as well—8:30 – 10:30 on June 16. <p>How to Present</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Story boards for the opening statement • Graphic showing diversity of representation (transparent overlays) • Leave behind documents <p>Joint Meeting After ours & Gateway meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discourage such a meeting? No—take cue from DWR. Not necessarily encourage it, but be prepared. <p>Prepping for Interview</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand roles, questions they will answer • Conference call possible, but prefer being present • FCD will e-mail regarding best date. Should have the questions by June 10th, 9:00 a.m. -11:00 a.m. 	
<p>5. Future Agenda Items / Other Items</p>	<p>Cancel June subregion meetings LC meeting will take place in June Still waiting for guidelines, thus not appropriate to start prioritizing.</p> <p>Future agenda items—private placement bonds as funding mechanism? Treasurer’s office may be interested, focusing on county treasurers, transpo agencies, etc., rather than traditional private purchasers. Look at May revise details for expenditure authority. Currently in adopted budget, but could be pulled. Operations approps should follow capital outlay, so if no cap outlay, why fund ops for that—could come</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

	into play.	
6. Meeting Adjournment	Meeting Adjourned at 11:34 a.m.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action
7. Next Meeting:	LA IRWMP Leadership Committee: Los Angeles County Public Works, Wednesday, June 24, 2009, 9:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •