

**Greater Los Angeles Integrated Regional Water Management Plan
North Santa Monica Bay Steering Committee
Las Virgenes MWD
Conference Room B
4232 Las Virgenes Road
Calabasas, CA 91302**

**Tuesday February 19, 2008
9:00 am – 11:30 am**

Meeting Notes

Present:

William Knebel
Barbara Cameron
Randal Orton

Frank Kuo
Tom West
Leighanne Reeser

Michael Hart (phone)
Oliver Galang (phone)

Agenda Item	Topic/ Issue	Discussion	Action Item/Follow Up
1	Welcome, Introductions	Randal led meeting introductions.	
2	Review January 15 Meeting Notes	Review and approval of January notes was deferred until the next meeting.	Any other comments please email to Tom at twest@rmcwater.com .
3	Discuss Jan. 23 Leadership Committee Agenda items	Below is a summary of topics discussed at the January 23 Leadership Committee and discussion from the Steering Committee <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. March 3 there will be a conference call of the water supply agencies with Ed Means to discuss revisiting the IRWMP water supply target in light of recent environmental decisions and climate change projects. 2. Noted that the MOU and operating guidelines were discussed at the LC meeting. The subsequent SC discussion on the topic is covered below under item 8. 	Randal to send email to Hector requesting agenda item to discuss negotiations with Ventura on Prop. 84 funds. Once available, Tom W. will circulate the revised MOU to the steering committee.
4	Kickoff 2008 Consultant Activities	Tom West provided an overview of the consultant team's proposed approach to the tasks below and asked for feedback from the SC. The SC comments will be discussed among the consultant team with a final approach presented to the LC at the February 27 meeting for their concurrence before the consultant team proceeds further.	

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>1. Strategy to update IRWM Plan in 2008: Tom described how the team's plan was to not make wholesale changes to the region's IRWM plan but rather to make enough modifications so that the region can qualify for Prop. 84 implementation funds as soon as they become available. Benefit of the strategy is to keep moving forward in the absence of clear guidance from the State as they have been delayed. Also, this approach leaves the opportunity to secure further planning grant funds to either examine larger issues or to reformat plan to more closely align with the State water plan now being updated.</p> <p>Randal commented that there are overlap/congruence between the IRWM plan update task and the planning grant task. In addition, Randal noted that he didn't think it was the Region's role to prepare a plan that more or less replaces the work which DWR staff is responsible for performing.</p> <p>2. Planning needs: The SC members noted that the NSMB sub-region has lots of opportunity for further conservation and this should be a focus of planning grant funding. All concurred that a sub-region wide plan on conservation could both move conservation efforts forward and possibly serve as a model for other sub-regions. Randal also noted that this is an important area of emphasis between water and energy/greenhouse gases as conservation reduces the amount of energy needed to pump water throughout the State. This is highlighted by the fact that peak water consumption in the hot summer days also coincides with peak energy demand. In particular, Randal noted that he'd like to see energy companies funnel money saved from conservation back into conservation programs.</p> <p>It was discussed that the NSMB sub-region has unique needs and that the update to the IRWM plan needs to do more to emphasize this uniqueness. In addition to unique needs, it was also discussed how water management strategies in the sub-region really are linked together. For example, fire management plays an important role in managing carbon release and the water quality is similarly linked with conservation. Randal discussed trying to develop a diagram that shows how these strategies are linked in the NSMB sub-region.</p> <p>3. DAC outreach: The SC noted that there are groups in the NSMB sub-region that have extensive outreach programs to DACs to bring kids and families from DACs in the inner city areas to the recreation areas in the NSMB. It was agreed that the SC should solicit program information</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>from these parties who include Malibu, the MRCA, the MRT, and Agoura Hills to name a few. Randal said that the SC should engage Shelly Luce from the SMBRC on their outreach programs.</p> <p>A question that was discussed was the definition of a DAC. The State's definition is based on income level where people reside. However, the SC noted that benefits can be created both where people live, work, or visit. In general there was concurrence that the LA region's efforts need to engage with groups regionally to incorporate their efforts. For example, an opportunity is the Alley Parkway program (head by Paula Daniels and Madeline Glickfeld at the UCLA Institute of the Environment). Probably the best way to do this is to develop a workshop for interested parties.</p> <p>4. CIP strategy development: It was noted that there is concern that CIP means construction and concrete. For the NSMB, this is not necessarily the case. However, NSMB SC members noted that they do want to make sure that projects included in their efforts qualify for funding. For the CIP strategy development, Frank noted that some of the intention is for it to be an education process for those who aren't familiar with the intent and process of developing at CIP. Tom noted that the ultimate goal is to establish a set of projects to achieve a certain goal within a particular time frame and establish the set of implementation steps needed to achieve this goal. It was noted that the NSMB Project Implementation Group has been formed to examine the NSMB sub-region's projects not so much to push individual projects but rather develop a slate of projects (not an a la carte effort). Leighanne pointed out that the South Bay was beginning to re-address project and is considering conducting a 1 day workshop or taking on to a stakeholder workshop. The NSMB SC noted that in the CIP strategy development that they want to see different project categories identified.</p>	
5	Funding Contributions Status	<p>Leighanne reviewed the entities from the NSMB who have pledged to contribute to the IRWMP consultant team efforts. These include LVWMD, LA County, West Basin MWD, Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Malibu, Malibou Lake Mountain Club, MWD, the RCDSMM, SMBRC and Westlake Manangement Association.</p> <p>Based on the pledges to date, the NSMB is far along but not quite to the \$200k goal for the sub-region. It was discussed that the NSMB could approach the County Supervisor's office (via Susan Nissman) to help make up the difference but, in the immediate term, to continue with outreach rather than go to Susan at this time.</p> <p>To assist with outreach effort, Randal reiterated LVMWD is offering up to a \$5k</p>	<p>Joe to draft letter to the Supervisor's office to request contribution to IRWMP.</p> <p>Barbara to update the contributions list from NSMB entities and distribute to Randal, Joe and Melina.</p> <p>NSMB chair and co-chair</p>

		<p>match to entice others to contribute further.</p> <p>It was noted that in previous discussions about soliciting funds, some entities (it was believe Calabasas and Westlake) noted that it would be easier to sell contributions to the political bodies if there was more clarity on how future grant funds from Prop. 84 would be distributed. However, it was acknowledged that it may not be possible to come up with a formula (at least not in the next month) and that it is hoped that the process for evaluating projects and collaborating among the sub-regions will yield an equitable distribution of implementation funding.</p> <p>It was noted that the uncertainty of how funds are to be distributed is fueling the Gateway Cities to break away and form their own region. At the recent statewide IRWMP summit, DWR suggested that they may hold up release of Prop. 84 funds until the Gateway Cities issue is resolved. It was believed that the Gateway Cities will want a clear formula. It was agreed that this issue needs to be brought up at the next LC meeting.</p> <p>Randal asked that SC members come up with suggestions for possible formulas. Oliver suggested some minimum baseline amount for each sub-region. It was agreed that a good first step would be consensus at the LC level on the minimum share principle.</p> <p>Barbara noted that this is an issue to be resolved as Prop. 84 and 1E funds are likely to come sooner rather than later based on DWR comments at the Statewide IRWMP summit.</p>	<p>to contact Hector to request Gateway Cities issue be put on next LC meeting agenda.</p> <p>Randal to contact Alex and Joe to discuss issue of funding distribution to understand previous points they made.</p>
6	Outreach to Cities and Other Parties	<p>It was noted that the NSMB sub-region in general remains light on NGO participation, in particular given the significant role that NGO's play in the sub-region. Of particular note is Heal the Bay—Randal to contact Meridith McCarthy to see if she will participate in NSMB SC as she is already participating in the South Bay.</p> <p>Joe is finalizing the letter to possible participants. Randal to call Joe to find out where the letter is at.</p> <p>Randal will circulate his draft board letter to provide information to those who may need it before going to their boards.</p>	<p>Randal to contact Joe to find out status of letter to potential participants. Put outreach on the agenda for next SC meeting.</p> <p>Randal to circulate his draft letter to the LVMWD board.</p> <p>Randal to contact Meridith McCarthy at Heal the Bay about participating in NSMB steering committee meetings.</p>

7	Steering Committee Participation	See discussion above on Item 6.	Barbara to edit and circulated letter to Ventura County WPD inviting them to participate on steering committee.
8	MOU and Operating Guidelines	<p>Below are comments provided by the SC on the MOU and operating guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - concern about statement regarding executive level; this has less relevance to the NSMB as those who are participating have served well but may not necessarily be considered executive level. - Language has too many details about how alternates are chosen. For the NSMB, they want to make sure that alternates are not necessarily assigned to a person. Also, alternates are selected at the discretion of the SC. - With regard to funding contributions, there was discussion about how to interpret the term “to the extent feasible”. The SC reiterated that it should be clear that there is no requirement to contribute funds. - Should take out reference to Prop. 50 guidelines as this effort has passed. Instead, should acknowledge that one purpose of the MOU is to meet minimum state guidelines for governance. Also should not that activities are not restricted to just Prop. 50 or 84 funds. - A question came up if the intent of this MOU is to close out the previous MOU? 	
9	Draft Legislative Principles	No discussion.	
10	Project Working Group	The project working group met. Currently there is not follow up meeting scheduled for the project working group.	
11	Other Funding Sources	No discussion.	
12	Future agenda items	Randall requested that the “Egyptian” award be presented at the next steering committee meeting to recognize the hardest working steering committee members.	
13	Next Meetings	Leadership Committee Meeting February 27: 9:30 - noon LACDPW in Alhambra	

		<p>NSMB Steering Committee March 12, 9 am to 11:30 am LVMWD, Conference Room B **Note that the meeting was schedule for March 18 but SC members decided to change it..</p> <p>Leadership Committee Meeting January 23: 9:30 - noon LACDPW in Alhambra</p>	
--	--	---	--