

**Greater Los Angeles Integrated Regional Water Management Plan  
Lower San Gabriel and Los Angeles River Watershed  
May 1, 2007, 12:30 pm to 2 pm  
Lakewood City Hall, Executive Board Meeting Room**

**Present:**

Desi Alvarez, Downey  
John Biggs, Brown and Caldwell  
Shirley Birosik, LA RWQCB (via phone)  
Deborah Chankin, Gateway Cities  
Suzanne Dallman, LASGRWC  
Michael Drennan, Brown and Caldwell  
Belinda Faustinos, RMC

Terri Grant, LACFCD  
Andree Hunt, Malcolm Pirnie (via Phone)  
Kosta Kaporis, Los Angeles  
Frank Kuo, LA Co. DPW/FCD  
Eric Leung, LBWD  
Joone Lopez, CBMWD  
Ed Means, Malcolm Pirnie (via Phone)

Steve Mirrer, Paramount  
Toby Moore, Golden State Water  
Kevin Wattier, LBWD  
Jason Weeks, WRD  
Tom West, RMC (via Phone)  
Mary Zauner, LACSD

<b>Topic/Issue</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Action/Follow up</b>
<b>1. Introductions</b>	Belinda Faustinos opened the meeting at 12:38 pm with introductions.	
<b>1b. Approve 3/20/07 Meeting Minutes</b>	No Action	
<b>2. Leadership Committee May 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting: Review of Draft Agenda / Direction to Chair</b>	Reviewed draft agenda for May 3 <sup>rd</sup> Leadership Committee meeting. Noted the location change of the meeting from LA County offices to Metropolitan Water District Offices. Specific discussion regarding Decision-Making Structure and Prioritization Framework tabled until agenda items 3 & 4.	
<b>3. Greater LA IRWMP Decision-Making Structure – Draft Technical Memorandum (TM)</b>	<p>Ed Means led a discussion via conference call on the Draft Decision-Making Structure TM.</p> <p><b>Leadership Committee Size.</b> The general discussion on size of the Leadership Committee favored expanding it to 16 members (3 from each subregion with the county as the chair). Discussion took place regarding the role of the Leadership Committee in selecting representatives for the Leadership Committee. The general consensus was to maintain subregional autonomy in selection of representatives and avoid the perception of dictation by the Leadership Committee.</p> <p><b>Representation On Leadership Committee.</b> The general discussion covered the representation of the water management areas and the autonomy of subregions in selecting representatives. The general consensus was there is value in representing water management areas as well as autonomy in the subregion to select representatives. Steering Committee reached consensus of support of Decision-Making Structure Option 2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General Consensus of the Steering Committee: Expand Leadership Committee to 16 Members. Representatives should be selected by Steering Committees. Prefer Option 2 of Draft TM and generally opposed to Option 1. The Leadership Committee should only provide oversight and coordination. Committee was also opposed to formalized</li> </ul>

*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>of Draft TM.</p> <p><b>Leadership Committee Formalization.</b> Discussion on the formalization of the procedures of the Leadership Committee. General consensus against the formalization of seating assignments for the Leadership Committee Meetings.</p> <p><b>Funding and Prioritization.</b> Discussion on the role of the Leadership Committee and Steering Committee roles in the prioritization of projects and allocation of funding. General consensus that the Leadership Committee should divide funds among subregions and then allow subregions to prioritize projects and select projects for funding.</p>	<p>seating at the Leadership Committee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consensus that the name of the Leadership Committee should be changed to Coordinating Council, to better reflect its role.</li> </ul>
<b>4. Prioritization Framework</b>	<p>Tom West provided via conference call an overview of the Draft Project Prioritization Framework as outlined in the draft Technical Memorandum.</p> <p>The committee held a discussion on the role of the framework if the Region will not be eligible for Round 2 of Prop 50. The framework will be used to sort projects in the database in preparation for the anticipated requirements in Prop 84 that will require regions to prioritize projects. In addition starting early will allow the framework to be refined independent of a hard deadline and as a tool to look objectively at the project, but not to act as the final judge of all projects. The view was also expressed that a prioritization framework may not be needed to make a final decision, but could be useful as a planning tool to look at subregional needs and then develop projects for grant funding. It was also discussed how a prioritization framework could be used as a tool to spur improving projects or going out to find more projects.</p> <p>Concern was expressed this version of the framework would go straight to the state and may possibly affect other funding sources. There was consensus that it is not appropriate to formally adopt a list of projects in June. The committee wants the opportunity to judge output from framework and revise to better assess what the best projects are.</p> <p>Additionally, the question was raised to the scoring structure where a project with 10 times the benefit quantity only received 1.5 times the points awarded to the smaller project. One commenter recommended that the scale of points should be directly proportional to the benefit, and that benefit cost ratio should be considered.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General Consensus of the Steering Committee: Move forward with the Prioritization Framework to review preliminary results of ranking, but do not issue final approval of this version. Steering Committee wants to reserve the right to review results and provide feedback to further improve the Framework.</li> </ul>
<b>5. Prop 50 and 84 Updates</b>	<p>Frank Kuo provided an update on Prop 50 and 84.</p> <p><b>Prop 50.</b> The County has received an official letter from the State regarding Prop 50 funds. The County received clarification that reimbursement with grant funds can be invoiced for work after January 18, 2007.</p> <p>The County has sent the State a standard agreement template for projects. However, the</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.*

	<p>County is working on with the State to revise the template to outline the roles of the State, County, and project to assure there is not an excessive burden on the County for administration or the projects for compliance. They are working on developing a standard agreement that everyone can sign instead of individual agreements.</p> <p>The County gave representatives of the State a tour of 8 of the 13 projects.</p> <p>The County is still addressing the issue of administrative costs associated with grant administration, and is suggesting that administrative costs will be based on the length of project and project budget.</p> <p><b>Prop 84.</b> No new items.</p>	
<b>6. Activities in May and June: Project Identification / Integration</b>	<p>Assuming Leadership Committee gives go ahead for Prioritization Framework, the first run should be complete by Mid-May. However, this will require information from subregions on some of the ranking criteria. Discussed and agreed to hold an additional Steering Committee in Mid-May to review prioritization framework results.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional Steering Committee Meeting Scheduled for May 15th</li> </ul>
<b>7. Future Agenda Items / Other Items</b>	No Action	
<b>8. Next Meeting</b>	<p>Steering Committee Special Meeting on May 15, 2007 COG Offices, Paramount.</p> <p>Next Steering Committee meeting on June 5, 2007 at 12:30 PM to 2 PM, at Lakewood City Hall Executive Board Room, Lakewood, CA</p> <p>Next Leadership Committee meeting on May 3, 2007 at 8:00 AM, at MWD, Los Angeles.</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.*