

### ATTENDING AGENCIES/ORGANIZATIONS

1. UC Irvine
2. Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
3. CalEMA
4. Amigos de los Rios
5. USACE
6. Orange County Public Works
7. The River Project
8. Los Angeles County Flood Control District
9. Los Angeles County Flood Control District – Water Resources Division
10. Los Angeles County Department of Public Works – Water Resources Division

### SUMMARY

Los Angeles County Assistant Director Mark Pestrella began the meeting with brief opening remarks. Pestrella spoke of collaboration and called *California’s Flood Future* “a telling report about flood management and water resources.” He said he was proud of the effort made to develop the report because it reflects the finding of many different documents. Pestrella said that infrastructure needs “TLC” but that “TLC” takes a lot of money. He went on to say he was excited that DWR has decided to encourage and promote IWM as an approach.

DWR’s Terri Wegener and USACE’s Kim Gavigan lead the approximately 60-minute Alhambra presentation. A deeper discussion of each *California’s Flood Future* recommendation followed.

Key meeting questions/suggestions Included:

- Need legal framework for requiring climate change, integrated regional projects, and agency alignment
- Education should be tailored to meet the needs of specific groups
- There are differing levels of emergency response training
- Work IWM into laws regarding planning
- Reconsider state use of SCAG projections in water supply and flood management planning
- Who will carry out these recommendations?
- Prop 218 needs to be evaluated
- Need incentives or disincentives to change land use decisions; financial impacts or benefits will encourage less development in floodplains. Need to look holistically at tax credits and conservation credits to encourage beneficial uses of floodplains
- The state should prioritize water supply and flood management over other priorities like prisons

### RECOMMENDATIONS DISCUSSION

(Italics indicate ideas or phrases from meeting presenters)

#### Recommendation 1

**Conduct regional flood risk assessments to better understand statewide flood risk.**

- *While we have been in Southern California we've come to see that there very different approaches to flood management.*
- Would it more appropriate to “identify opportunities to maintain natural systems” as opposed to “identify opportunities to restore natural systems?”
- *The Highlights actually does make this wording change – “Important to maintain natural systems”*
- *People are working on flood risk management with other localities.*
- How do you also put it into a legal framework? It seems to me that IRWM is missing the legal authority. There are two IRWMs in this region because it is political and that is never going to change.
- *Build in a framework of meeting a common goal.*
- On a local level this is unimportant.
- *Back up policy with water code, for example, with regulations.*
- *Ecosystem protection is important at the state and federal level, not at a local level.*

## **Recommendation 2**

### **Increase public and policymaker awareness about flood risks to facilitate informed decisions.**

- We have to be very careful about educating and outreach about flood risk. It might be wise to raise climate change and uncertainty up a slot instead of making it an afterthought. On that theme, if we only do outreach on flood risk we will lose every other one of the things we are trying to integrate, because flood trumps all. Flood is a fear-based thing; flood is fear; flood will eliminate every other thing out there. I caution you – if you care about integration – from focusing on flood specifically.
- Eliminate the word “control,” stop using the word “flood.” Flood management needs to be discussed in conjunction with water management.
- This district has a dual responsibility for flood control and water efficiency, without eliminating the word flood control.
- Focus is on water control but what impact is this going to have on the land? Information needs to also be distributed to the average homeowner, specific to what they care about.
- *Education should be tailored to meet needs of specific groups.*
- There needs to be a starting point, a baseline. There are no tangible results. There has to be a way to measure progress.

- *Performance measures with a base line so that we can measure our progress and reassess our progress.*

### **Recommendation 3**

#### **Increase support for flood emergency preparedness, response, and recovery programs to reduce flood impacts.**

- Part of the problem is that everyone is a “disaster leader.” I thought they were being trained but really they are getting online training. We need to assess who is physically trained. There are different types of training, and this may have different levels of effectiveness.

### **Recommendation 4**

#### **Encourage land use planning practices that reduce the consequences of flooding.**

- Are you trying to create a statewide program? Where is this [recommendation] applicable? At what level are these three bullets aimed?
- I’d like to see how water supply, flood risk and land use has a nexus. You see how land use decisions impact water supply decisions
- Residents and policy makers need to understand that land use decisions do more than create or modify flood risk.
- Land use is about increased taxes and revenue.
- We have to look at things futuristically. Look ahead, look at what the federal government is doing. We have to look at that because the locals are never going to stop building in the floodplains.
- Look to the future for a possible benefit.
  - *It’s complicated. There are many pressures. Look creative at financing ideas and credits.*
  - *Land use decisions are related to revenue. Look to benefits/credits to balance potential revenue.*

### **Recommendation 5**

#### **Implement flood management from regional, systemwide, and statewide perspectives to provide multiple benefits.**

- At a Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) transportation plan meeting I asked if they looked at water. We need to incorporate water management into metropolitan planning organizations so that they are doing this as well. We need to bring these people to the table.
- Add the word supply in the fourth bullet (between “water and flood management”)
- Concerned that SCAG data must be used in planning even though the numbers are not reliable.
  - *Reconsider requirement about using SCAG data*
- Local planning organizations look at water management from a regional perspective.

- Question about how the corps works on permitting.

#### **Recommendation 6**

##### **Increase collaboration among public agencies to improve flood management planning, policies and investments.**

- We need to utilize the various councils of governments.
  - *Incorporate flood risk management into local council of governments.*
- Add the word 'integrated' on the slides
- Who is carrying out the recommendations? Will there be a progress report like the USACE report card?
  - *Phase 2 will have more answers*

#### **Recommendation 7**

##### **Establish sufficient and stable funding mechanisms to reduce flood risk.**

- I've looked at prop 218 and there has to be a lot of planning if you want to go after it. Have to look at which aspect of a general vote vs. the landowner benefit. Need to look at things region by region to see what will be most effective. Need to have some time for assessments.
  - *In relation to 218, it may be different in different regions. The proposition needs to be evaluated.*
- We fund three things in this state budget. Prison System, education (didn't list a third). I think water is an important one. State budget is just about the only stable source of funding. I'm not sure anyone has brought this up.
  - *Prioritize water supply and flood management over other priorities like prisons.*
- DWR funding fairs have recently kicked off. These fairs are an opportunity to look at funding sources in your region; information about opportunities for all types of water management, from flooding to supply, will be available.
- Upcoming strategic plan meetings are an opportunity to have a voice in what IRWM will be in the future. The workshops are free and a good opportunity to have an impact.

###