

**DRAFT Minutes of the  
Plenary Meeting**

Tuesday, December 13, 2016  
Los Angeles Department of Water and Power



716 10<sup>th</sup> Street  
Suite 200  
Sacramento  
California 95814

Phone  
916/ 552-5885  
Fax  
916/ 552-5877

[www.cuwcc.org](http://www.cuwcc.org)

**Attendees:**

**Chair:**

Joe Berg - MWDOC

**Vice-Chair:**

Peter Vorster - The Bay Institute

**Group 1:**

Colin Close - Santa Rosa Water  
Susan Cordone - Cal Water  
Pat Costello - City of Napa  
Bob Day - San Jose Water Company  
Matt Dickens - Valencia Water Company  
Chris Dundon - Contra Costa County Water District  
Robert Estrada - LADWP  
Tyrone LaFay - Santa Barbara Co Water Agency  
Rosanna Lau - LADWP  
Elena Layugan - Upper District  
Monica Ling - Corona DWP  
Gisela Lopez, Gisela - Monte Vista Water District  
Sofia Marcus - LADWP  
Bill McDonnell - MWD  
Amy McNulty - Irvine Ranch Water District  
Gus Meza - West Basin MWD  
Lisa Morgan-Perales - Inland Empire Utilities Agency  
Sue Mosburg - Sweetwater Authority  
Robyn Navarra - Zone 7 Water Agency

Darleen Phares - Suburban Water Systems  
Carrie Pollard - Sonoma County Water Agency  
Krista Reger - Long Beach Water Department  
Stacy Rodriguez - Eastern Municipal Water District  
Brian Sandoval - Casitas MWD  
Francis Si Su - LADWP  
Rich Silva - LADWP  
Dean Wang - Long Beach Water Department  
Rob Whipple - Western Municipal Water District  
Misty Williams - Goleta Water District

**Group 2:**

Conner Everts - POWER  
Paul Herzog - Surfrider Foundation  
Wendy Phillips - League of Women Voters CA

**Group 3:**

Susan Hoskins - Landscape Integrity Films & Education  
Anita Matlock – Rainbird

**Staff/Other:**

Sarah Foley - CUWCC  
Gregory Weber - CUWCC  
Deb Whitney - Reclamation

**Welcome, Introductions, Announcements, Changes to Agenda**

Joe Berg called the meeting to order at 10:15. Introductions were made around the room. There were no changes to the agenda.

**Host Welcome**

Penny Falcon welcomed the group on behalf of LADWP noting the city's longstanding commitment to water conservation.

**Local Presentation**

Dave Pettyjohn, director of the water resources division of LADWP, gave the local presentation. Dave's presentation can be found on the Council website in the repository on the [Plenary page](#). Dave told the group that Los Angeles was one of the first cities in California to be fully metered. Conservation kicked into high gear with the drought of 1977. The department estimates that hardware saves 120,000 acre-feet per year. Since 1991 the city has

## Attachment #1

saved over 3 million acre-feet. He also discussed the city's One Water LA 2040 project that is a collaborative approach to managing drinking water, rain/storm water, groundwater, recycled water and wastewater.

Following Dave's presentation Richard Harasick also welcomed the group. Richard is senior assistant general manager for LADWP. Richard was a member of a Governor's task force on water conservation back in the early 1990s. That effort eventually led to the creation and adoption of the Council MOU. He noted that what California did in the early 90s made us a leader in the nation on conservation. He urged the group to continue its work and noted that there are a lot of water resource groups out there but only the Council deals exclusively with conservation.

### **Consent Calendar**

Joe asked the group to take a vote on the first two items (the minutes of the October plenary and the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter financials), and then briefly discuss the proposed budget.

Lisa Morgan-Perales moved to adopt the minutes and the financials. Chris Dundon seconded the motion. All agreed. None opposed. Motion carried.

Next, Joe explained that the proposed 2017 budget is a bare bones budget. The Board will probably have to revisit it early next year following the December vote on Council changes. This budget does not propose a dues increase and there are no salary adjustments.

Rob Whipple moved to approve the budget. Elena Layugan seconded the motion. All agreed. None opposed. Motion carried.

### **Council Transition**

Joe walked the group through a slide show from the recent Plenary webinar on the transition; that presentation can be found on the Council website [here](#). He explained that with conservation mandates imposed by the state, utility members of the Council wanted to see the organization move away from its emphasis on the MOU and BMP reporting toward an emphasis on helping member agencies reach their efficiency and conservation goals.

The Bylaws changes being proposed now are the minimum that will allow for the desired changes to take place. Because of these changes the Board does expect an impact on membership. Several Group 2 members have indicated they are not happy with these changes and plan to resign their membership. Joe said the Board hopes to attract those members back at some point. He invited members to submit their ballots at the meeting that day.

Greg Weber reminded the group that this vote is the result of a two-year strategic planning process that was focused initially on the progression concept. This was to be a framework an agency could use to benchmark its programs and chart its progress. However, the Board came to impasse on how to move forward or get agreement on the progression. Members couldn't agree on a governance structure and the role that reporting would play. The Board then considered several options including voluntary dissolution of the Council, involuntary dissolution, or a bylaws change.

Greg explained that going with the proposed bylaws change allows the Council to continue to exist as the same 501(c)(3) and avoids having to distribute all the organization's assets to other nonprofits, under Attorney General supervision.

## Attachment #1

Joe said that the goal of today's meeting is to inform members on the minimal set of bylaws changes to implement key changes and conform with law. In 2017 the Board anticipates making additional changes.

The key changes before the members in 2016 are:

- Moving away from the BMP framework
- Having a less cumbersome governance structure
- The elimination of separate member groups
- Allowing all members in good standing to vote
- Decision making at board and member level by majority rule
- A transition board, officers, and timeframe; and.
- A New name.

Greg Weber spoke again to the group and said the Board felt a dissolution of the Council would be costly and take a toll on membership, which is why Board members opted for the bylaws change approach.

Regarding the financial arrangements agreed to, Greg explained that Group 1 board members wanted financial stability, and to be able to keep three months of operating costs.

Meeting participants discussed the proposal. Some questions raised were around BMP reporting and if the database would still be available for those agencies who want to or need to report. The answer is yes: the database will still be available.

Some members pointed out the successes of the Council and how it changed the face of conservation in California, but that times have changed and they see a need for the Council to adapt.

Others pointed out the need for collaboration is not going away and that the Council should still be a venue for collaboration.

Following a short break members broke into discussion groups and were asked to give suggestions for the changes they would like to see contemplated during the transition year. Four specific questions were asked. After a lunch break, participants reconvened to report back on the group discussions.

Feedback and ideas generated based on the questions included:

Question #1 – What kind of board should the organization have?

- Representative of across the state, not sure about 21 board members, seems like a lot. Should also consider regional seats based on watershed.
- Regional representation but consider population, would like to see the same number of Board seats for nonprofit, environmental organization as there are now. Entire membership should nominate and vote for board.
- If the organization is transitioning to provide more tools and schools, we need to have members of the Board who are technical experts.
- Think beyond what the Council used to, there are other models out there, some elected, then some designated, traditional nonprofit board members either provide wealth, work or wisdom. Consider fewer Board meetings.
- The organization needs to be smaller, nimbler and spend less time on agendas, minutes, and other administrative matters.

## Attachment #1

### #2 Committees – Do we retire any or formulate new ones?

- Committees need to match the mission and vision of the organization. Committee structure will be more easily determined when the new structure is decided upon.
- Retaining committee membership can be a challenge unless there is a specific task or project with core people vested in doing it and targeted deadlines. The CII Committee has found this to be the case.

### #3 – Executive Director search – What are the key skills we are looking for?

- Strong leadership skills, fundraising ability, prior experience in helping grow an organization or restructure one. The person should be assertive with high level of connections. A philanthropy background would be good, as would a legislative background. Experience working with politicians and other stakeholders, and having a background in mediation or arbitration would also be good.
- Good marketing skills and finding a way to reach common ground in a timely way.
- Visionary strategist. Bringing everyone to table and get results.

### #4 – What will the relationship be with other organizations such as AWE and the Cal-Nevada chapter of AWWA moving forward?

- If the Council is going to become part of another organization, this needs to be decided upon prior to the ED search.
- If we joined with another organization, there could be cost savings in things like staff and overhead.
- Caution against losing California focus.
- We should invite AWE to a meeting to answer questions.
- Since California has stricter standards than other states, if we are absorbed by another organization, how do we meet what we have to do and what about our financial stake?

### **Ideas for New name**

Council members were asked to submit suggestions to staff by mid-January. The group discussed the ideas generated during the small work group time. Staff will collect the cards with name ideas on them and compile a list for Board and member consideration.

### **Looking Ahead: Member Priorities for 2017**

The group was asked what would make the investment in Council membership a positive return on investment for their organization. Ideas included:

- Training, including to the public.
- Demonstrate a link between water and the landscape community in educating customers.
- Produce savings studies. We need information on savings from washers. We need saturation studies, and a savings study on lawn to garden programs.
- California Friendly landscape maintenance resources.
- Ground truthing of pilots, evaluation of programs.
- More networking opportunities.

### **Adjourn**

Joe Berg adjourned the meeting at approximately 2:00 pm.