

TMDL Steering Committee Meeting of June 9, 2004

Meeting Notes

Background

The City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Sanitation, Regulatory Affairs Division (RAD) has accepted the invitation from the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) to facilitate and coordinate a Stakeholder-Led Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) effort for the development of TMDLs in the Los Angeles River and Ballona Creek watersheds. This June 9 meeting was the first meeting inviting highly interested parties or stakeholders to consider joining the effort as a member of the TMDL Steering Committee and provide initial input into the stakeholder-led process.

Attendees:

Please see attached copy (PDF file) of sign-in sheet.

Meeting Purpose and Objectives

After initial individual attendee self introductions, the purpose of the meeting was to hear from each stakeholder regarding their issues, concerns and overall goals and objectives. This is a first of several meetings to work out common goals and objectives toward creation of a Stakeholder Charter Agreement that will serve as guidance for the stakeholder group to address the TMDLs that are in process in the LA River and Ballona Creek.

Participant Issues, Concerns & Goals	Participant
Recognizing limitations with collective buy-in	
Challenges - No hidden agendas Frequent collaborative communication	Tom Mumley
Foster open communication and maintain the dialogue Concerned about impact on low income constituents Uncertainty of outcome creates fear Put it in laymen's terms to facilitate stakeholder involvement	Dario Gomez
Want a successful TMDL - everyone buys off on it. Everyone should define their needs up-front and communicate them	Cindy Lin
TEAMWork: T Trust - build by focusing on resolving consequences E Expectation & Engage - Put expectations on the table	Tom Mumley

<p>A Actions solve problems / Adaptive Implementation</p> <p>M Manage the process - strive for decisions that produce "bang for the buck" and see that decision-makers are clearly informed</p> <p>Work That's what it takes</p>	
<p>Opportunity for watershed transformation - beyond "engineering" aspects</p> <p>Maintain quality of life perspective (multi-purpose approach)</p> <p>Reach for multi-purpose opportunities even if they take a little more time and money</p> <p>Available time, resources, and science may not be as far along as ideals</p>	Rick Harter
<p>Concern about addressing multiple TMDLs one at a time</p> <p>Need environmental community involved</p>	Paul Thackur
<p>Desires healthy aquatic community and people can enjoy</p> <p>Need to take action in the face of uncertainty with data we have or can get quickly</p> <p>Integrated Resources approach needed - keep in mind the broader efforts</p>	Shelly Luce
<p>Watershed planning efforts that are rationale, allows public planning</p> <p>Effort needs to bring in broad stakeholder interests - smaller communities that are impacted</p> <p>Consider affordability</p>	Dan Grisct
<p>Wants to be an active part of process</p> <p>Power of participation</p> <p>Might end up with something they don't like but can live with</p> <p>Fear of setting targets on insufficient data</p> <p>Practical science, not perfect science</p>	Bonnie Teaford
<p>Adaptive implementation approach needed</p>	Rodney Anderson
<p>Partnership provides power</p> <p>Need list of options and solutions</p>	James Cowan
<p>Funding</p> <p>Scientifically based numerical TMDLs</p> <p>Ability to comply</p> <p>Teamwork</p> <p>Support funding opportunities and exemption to Prop 218 constraints (ACA 10)</p>	Maurice Oillataguerra
<p>Collaboration and partnerships</p> <p>Must work scientifically, politically, legally, jurisdictionally, and obtain funding</p>	Rod Kubomoto
<p>Overcome failure to get public support to pay</p> <p>Need to implement as a group for the long-term</p> <p>Overcome lack of regulatory flexibility</p>	Rod Kubomoto

Need to acknowledge what we have accomplished	
Continuity for the long-term pass on institutional knowledge	
Need to define what we can and can't do in this process	
Define opportunities and constraints to meet objectives	
Some issues may be systemic <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cultural lifestyle 	
Recognize what we can do and what needs to be deferred to another process	
SUMMARY OF GOALS AND OBJECTIVES	
Public Support Affordability Acknowledge and publicize what we've done (accomplishments) Tie to Public Health & Safety Find ways to develop funding Develop public trust - that we will use funds responsibly	
Adaptive Implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Move forward - Take risks - Jointly live with consequences - Don't just do the easy / cheap things first - Go with what we think will work - Documented in Implementation Plan Numeric Targets <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Can refine numeric target, but still must meet Water Quality Standards that are needed to sustain Designated Beneficial Uses - Can change interim targets - Numeric targets are there to meet Beneficial Uses - Targets can be changed, but goal is meeting Beneficial Use 	
Scientifically Based <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Practical science, not perfect science - Legally defensible - Politically acceptable 	
Process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Needs to have 100% support by group - The end product may not have 100% agreement of each individual - Transparent, open process - Collaboration, not consensus - Common base of knowledge (substance) - Interpretations can vary 	

– Be willing to move on and not get bogged down	
Understand Perspective of Every Player	
T. E. A. M. WORK (see Tom Mumley's remarks)	
Multi Purpose Projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Better sell – Balance between budget and other constraints – Must identify our priorities as stakeholders – Keep in mind other governing requirements – We all have to pay our proportional fair share 	
Stakeholders <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – MS4 Permittees – Industrial participation on broader watershed committee – Watershed management groups and plans – Vector control – Southern LA River communities – LACSD – Other Reg. Agencies (DFG / ACoE) – SCCWRP – PoLA – Dominguez Channel Stakeholders – Water Districts (WRD,WBMWD) – Conservancies: BC, SMC, RMC, Verdugo, Etc. – POTWs – SCAQMD 	
Environmental Groups: TreePeople N. E. Trees FoLAR	
Who to invite from private sector?	
I.D. who will be impacted by outcome?	
Who will have "heart burn" over potential outcomes?	
Multiple ways of communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Ad Hoc Meetings 	
Follow IRPs self-selecting process to build stakeholder group	
Start-up mode requires more frequent face-to-face meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Adapt as process evolves – Meet only when you have to 	
Organize technical sub-committees around specific pollutants	