

**Greater Los Angeles Integrated Regional Water Management Plan**  
**South Bay Steering Committee**  
**May 16, 2007**  
**3:00 pm – 5:00 pm**  
**West Basin MWD**

**Meeting Notes**

**Present:**

Leighanne Reeser	Kathleen McGowan	Mario Acevedo
Rob Beste	Tom West	Paul Herzog
Mary Zauner	Rich Nagel	Brett Kawakami
Terri Grant	Fernando Paludi	
Scott Valor	Michael Drennan (by phone)	
Hector Bordas	Jessica Hall	

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Topic/ Issue</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Action Item/Follow Up</b>
1	Welcome, Introductions	Rich Nagel began the round of introductions.	
2	Review April Meeting Notes	There was no discussion on the April Meeting minutes. This item was skipped over due to time constraints.	Email comments to Tom West and Leighanne
3	May 2 Leadership Committee meeting	<p>a. Governance discussion</p> <p>Discussion about sub-regions appointing Water Management Experts (WMEs) to serve on the Leadership Committee (LC) included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that WME body won't be independent of sub-region and take the regional perspective. Could include language in by-laws to clearly state that WME vote/opinion must be independent of vote/opinions expressed by steering committees (SCs)</li> <li>• Qualifications screening by LC will help make things more independent. Need to keep integrity of WME.</li> <li>• Comment that if LC selects WMEs, then it gives appearance of top down rather than bottom up.</li> <li>• Concern was expressed about continuing to rush the governance structure and have a decision made asap.</li> <li>• 11 members of the LC representing the sub-regions should be responsible for approving qualifications. Rich Nagel requested that</li> </ul>	<p>Recommendations to LC: Same suggestions as what Leadership Committee decided at the April meeting with 2 additions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) LC approves the SC appointments</li> <li>2) Consultants will prepare the qualifications for the WME seats.</li> </ol>

*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>consultants prepare qualifications to provide a measure of independence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Once qualifications are agreed to and nominations made, the LC needs to approve the 5 nominations of the WME's.</li> <li>• Terms should be limited to 3 years for all SC reps on the LC. Alternates to these reps would be from the steering committee, not from the representative's agency.</li> <li>• Rob- Ensure that there are specific guidelines on how projects are selected.</li> </ul>	
4	IRWM Program News	The County has submitted comments to the draft contract to DWR for review. The main issue of concern is liability.	
5	New steering committee member(s) to replace Fran Spivey-Weber	<p>With Fran's selection to the SWRCB, she will no longer be representing the environmental/habitat community on the South Bay steering committee.</p> <p>It was discussed and agreed that an official replacement for Fran's position should be made. The SC was asked to provide nominations for consideration at the next SC meeting.</p>	Email nomination(s) to replace Fran Spivey-Weber on the SC to Leighanne.
6	<p>Project Identification and Prioritization: review initial results and decide next steps to identify the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Top 30 projects in South Bay sub-region</li> <li>• Up to 10 projects for integration "exercise"</li> </ul> <p>Decide need/strategy for additional project review and prioritization discussions with steering committee and/or stakeholders</p>	<p>Handouts of the initial prioritization results were distributed. Below is a summary of the discussion.</p> <p>On summary of results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tom explained that these are initial results from applying the draft framework that had been developed. These results and the application of the results should be construed as a "practice" run for the real prioritization that will need to take place when projects are to be considered for a grant application or need to be included in an updated IRWMP.</li> <li>• One question was when will the project prioritization happen for real? The prioritization will need to be done in advance of Prop. 84 which will be later this year.</li> <li>• The consultant team will review the project lists and move any suspect regional projects on to a separate list but not delete them entirely in case one of the projects is legitimate.</li> <li>• In conducting this initial prioritization, some errors in either database entries have been identified. The most obvious errors involved projects mis-identified by project proponents as being in the South Bay sub-</li> </ul>	<p>SC members to review project lists and scoring information and provide comments to Tom West via email (<a href="mailto:twest@rmcwater.com">twest@rmcwater.com</a>) on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Observations on the results, including any errors and oversights.</li> <li>2. Suggestions on ways to improve the framework and analysis.</li> <li>3. Recommendations for how to identify the top 30 projects for the South Bay sub-region</li> <li>4. Recommend at least</li> </ol>

		<p>region.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The question of how to incorporate “regional” projects into sub-regional ranking. One suggestion was that regional project should “reside” in the sub-region of the lead entity.</li> <li>• Tom reminded the SC that the prioritization framework will continue to evolve and that comments received on this initial project prioritization will be summarized and incorporated at a later date. Tom also reminded the SC that this framework is meant to be one tool for the SC to use as it considers which projects it should put forth as the most important projects for the sub-region.</li> </ul> <p>General comments on overall quality of information in the database and in developing more comprehensive set of project information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jessica Hall noted on the maps that there were large areas within the sub-region that lacked any projects. In general, these appear to correspond to disadvantaged areas. This suggests a need to outreach to these areas to either (1) obtain any project information they may have and/or (2) work with those communities to identify and develop projects.</li> <li>• On a similar note, Jessica commented that many projects proposed by non-profits will likely rank low on readiness-to-proceed criteria because of their limited capacity to develop projects.</li> <li>• Concern was expressed that prioritizing projects creates a conflict between cooperation and competition.</li> <li>• It was suggested that some type of filter be developed to limit the number of projects by agency or to identify the top 1 or 2 projects by agency.</li> <li>• It was suggested that some effort be done to look at linking habitat by creating corridors that link patches of open space.</li> </ul> <p>Next steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tom explained that the SC is tasked with developing a list of 30 projects which it would consider as the most important projects for the sub-region. The SC is also tasked with identifying up to 10 projects to go through a project integration exercise.</li> <li>• For the project integration exercise, Tom suggested that the SC consider selecting 2-3 projects that emphasized water supply, water quality, and habitat/open space and identify other benefits that could be included in these projects. Tom also suggested that the SC consider 2-</li> </ul>	<p>one project for the project integration exercise.</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>3 projects that are geographically located near each other for integration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To assist with this effort, Tom will email out corrected lists showing the ranking information for all projects along with the information that influenced the scoring.</li> </ul>	
7	Future Agenda Items/Other Items	Discuss future activities/accomplishments after current project scope is completed at the end of June 2007	
8	Next Meetings	<p>May 30, 2007 Steering Committee Meeting 10:00 am to 1 pm Location: West Basin MWD Purpose: Special SC meeting to review project information and identify Top 30 projects for sub-region along with 10 projects for integration exercise.</p> <p>June 7, 2007 Leadership Committee Meeting Time: to be confirmed Location: to be confirmed Purpose: An agenda will be distributed to the SC once available.</p> <p><b>June 13, 2007 Steering Committee Meeting</b> <b>11:00 am to 1:00 pm</b> <b>Location: West Basin MWD</b> <b>Purpose: Regular SC meeting to review results of prioritization and project integration exercise and results of Leadership Committee meeting</b></p>	