DECEMBER 17, 2020 LWI REGION 8 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING MATERIALS

Agenda.		1
Meeting	Minutes	2
Meeting	Poll Results	4



Jefferson, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, & St. Charles Parishes

- I. Regional Steering Committee Introductions
- II. Roll Call
- III. Approval of October 22, 2020 Minutes

(vote required)

- **IV. LWI Program Updates**
 - a. Updates & Comments from LWI state representatives
 - b. Updates from the RPC
- V. Coalition Working Group Updates
- **VI. Develop Coalition Recommendations**
- VII. Public Comment
- VIII. Questions/Adjourn

(vote required)

Jefferson, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, & St. Charles Parishes

LWI Capacity Building Grant – Region 8 Regional Steering Committee Meeting December 17, 2020 9:00 AM – 11:00 AM

I. Regional Watershed Planning

a. Online meeting etiquette: Microphones/Phones on mute unless you are speaking Questions may be asked via the question box

• Jessica Dandridge

· Danielle Honor

Ken Dugas

Votes: Motion, second, & online poll or voice/email tally (committee members only)
Public comments will be at end of meeting, notify staff via question box or verbally

II. Roll Call

Present

- Stephanie Bruning
- Blaise Pezold
- Matt Falati
- · Albertine Kimble
- · Maggie Talley

<u>Absent</u>

- Ronald Carrere, Jr.
- Tyler Antrup
- · Derek Boese

III. Approval of October 22, 2020 Minutes

- a. Moved by: Blaise Pezold; Seconded by: Maggie Talley
- b. 100% in favor to approve the October 22, 2020 minutes.

IV. LWI Program Updates

- a. Updates from the state:
 - There's a Council on Watershed management meeting today from 1:30-3:30pm.
 - The state's working on a nature based solutions training program that will launch sometime, in the first quarter of next year.
- b. Updates from the RPC:
 - None

V. Coalition Working Group Updates

- a. November Working Group Briefing:
 - 1. Funding:
 - Act as "conduit" for securing/distributing
 - 2. Planning:
 - · Regional & Sub-area Plans
 - · Project review & prioritization
 - 3. Coordination & Innovation:
 - Resource Sharing (best practices, data, modeling, etc.)
 - Outreach to public, development/real estate industry
 - Setting Standards
 - Intergovernmental coordination

Jefferson, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, & St. Charles Parishes

- b. December Working Group Briefing: Three main questions posed by the state
 - 1. Who should be in the coalition?
 - Working group consensus: a mix of public, private, elected officials, & community members.
 - How fixed should boundaries be?
 - · Specify how boundaries can be changed in charter
 - Make sure to account for what grant funding can approve
 - Boundaries should be legislatively authorized to help prevent corruption
 - 3. How will potential funds be passed to parishes?
 - The coalition could act as a landing pad for grant funds
 - Cooperative agreements do not have been routed through the coalition.

C. RSC Additions

- Administration/staffing is important to factor into fund management
- Project funding contingent on consistency with regional plans & standards
- Will funding be to the coalition or through coalition is an important distinction?
- · How do current recommendations relate to eventual permanent authority/funding?

V. Develop Coalition Recommendations

- a. To start the conversation RPC staff and have drafted three proposed models. RSC members are urged to comment, correct, and change.
- b. RSC comments on Model A
 - Does this model allow for widespread input from multiple stakeholder groups? Gov.
 Task Force would be a good model to follow to include more voices.
 - May limit innovation/flexibility by not including non-govt. voices
 - Does this introduce another level of enforcement/regulation, or conflict with local government authority?
 - How to ensure standards/regulations are strong enough to prevent non-compliance or opt-out. Consider the appeals process and who should be on that board.
 - Working as a regional governmental entity can enable the difficult discussion to have the backing of the region.

C. RSC comments on Model B

- A model drawback is grant dependency. When grant funding is no longer available the coalition might have to disband. (This can also be a defining issue for some government entities that have no millage or flexible funding.
- Where will the community and other organizations place their trust? A new organization will have to struggle to build trust and a reputation.
- If lack of funding causes coalition disbandment who and what communities or who will then be negatively affected
- Who will the coalition be accountable to?
- A benefit is a new agency could function without existing biases; greater potential for regionalism

Jefferson, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, & St. Charles Parishes

d. RSC comments on Model C

- Existing precedent (Audubon, City Park)
- Potential to enhance equity/diversity/representation
- How does administration/management/decision-making work between agencies/partners, especially long term?
 - This will need to be established in the strategic planning session
- This model can fill in the gaps by utilizing the benefits of both models and extend coalition reach.
- · Helps to support equity across the region

e. What agencies could take the lead?

- Parish & municipality
- · Levee board
- · Soil & water conservation
- · The water collaborative
- The RPC was suggested but to make this possible it will entail authorization & approval from the RPC board as well as state entities.
- · University ie UNO CHART
- · Parish staff could add capacity/assistance, rotate/share responsibilities
- · Consider a transition team

f. The timeline going forward

- Preliminary recommendations are due in January
- Between January and spring 2021 a vetting process will pass through the state teams, legal counsel, and regional partners.
- n May of 2021, a finalized recommendation is due to the state LWI team.
- The goal is for a package to be presented to legislation in Spring 2022.
- Fall 2022 is the projected time to start standing up the coalition.

VI. Public Comment

a. None

X. Question/Adjourn

- a. Moved by: Maggie Talley; Seconded by: Blaise Pezold
- b. 100% in favor to adjourn