...A United Voice for the Santa Ana River Watershed

OWOW STEERING COMMITTEE

SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

OCTOBER 20, 2016

Committee Members	
Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority Representatives	
Ronald W. Sullivan, Convener, Eastern Municipal Water District	Present
Thomas P. Evans, Western Municipal Water District	Present
County Supervisor Representatives	
Marion Ashley, Riverside County Board of Supervisors	Present
Shawn Nelson, Orange County Board of Supervisors	Absent
Curt Hagman, San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors	Present
County Mayor Representatives	
Ron Loveridge, Mayor, City of Riverside	Absent
Beth Krom, Councilmember, City of Irvine	Present
Jon Harrison, Mayor Pro Tem, City of Redlands	Present
Business Committee Representative	
Jim Hessler, Director of West Coast Operations, Altman Plants	Present
Environmental Committee Representative	
Garry Brown, President, Orange County Coastkeeper	Present
Regional Water Quality Control Board Representative	
Linda Ackerman, Vice Chair, Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board	Present
STAFF PRESENT	Celeste Cantú; Larry McKenney; Mark Norton; Dean Unger; Mike Antos; Kelly Berry

The OWOW Steering Committee meeting was called to order at 11:02 a.m. by Ronald W. Sullivan, Convener, at the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority, 11615 Sterling Ave., Riverside, California.

1. **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

2. **PUBLIC COMMENTS**
   There were no public comments.

3. APPROVE MEETING MINUTES – July 7, 2016

MOVED, approve the Consent Calendar.

Result:	**Adopted (Passed; 8-0-1)**
Motion/Second:	Brown/Harrison
Ayes:	Ackerman, Ashley, Brown, Evans, Harrison, Hessler, Krom, Sullivan
Nays:	None
Abstentions:	Hagman
Absent:	None

4. NEW BUSINESS

A. Disadvantaged Community Involvement Program (SC#2016.14)

Mike Antos provided a PowerPoint presentation on the Disadvantaged Communities Involvement Program. $510 million was allocated for the IRWM Program within Proposition 1; of that, no less than 10% must be spent ensuring involvement of members of disadvantaged communities in the IRWM process. This results in a $6.3 million non-competitive grant for the Santa Ana River Watershed for the Program. Grant Guidelines for the program were released by DWR in July 2016.

The OWOW Disadvantaged Communities Involvement Program has three program elements: 1) Strengths and Needs Assessment, 2) Education and Engagement, and, 3) Project Development. Tasks within these program elements were drawn from Grant Guidelines or earlier programs completed elsewhere in the state referenced in the Guidelines. Compilation of the proposal included participation of groups with specific expertise applicable to the program and its goals. The proposal before the Steering Committee for consideration was built from previous OWOW reports and research and is the best combination of required and allowable activities.

Committee Member Hessler voiced his desire for more clarity in the definition of deliverables in the community engagement intern program before SAWPA moves forward, and noted that the objectives and deliverables are not clearly and concisely defined. Antos stated the program exists at the California State University (CSU) system and that he would work with them to clarify the objectives and deliverables.

Committee Member Brown noted $4.8 million of the $6.3 million will be paid to consultants (the Program Partners), and that he would rather see a campaign to do something on the ground level with measurable results than paying a majority of the funds to consultants. Brown also desired more clarity in the definition of deliverables. The proposal contains a patchwork of good ideas, but is lacking in details as to measurable results and is weighted too heavily toward paid consultants. Antos noted the outcome is to enhance involvement, which is tricky to measure. Perhaps survey documents could be developed to assess pre and post.

Committee Member Evans asked if this could be done in two years, instead of three. Antos expressed the three-year timeframe was more advantageous in building trust within the communities. Evans stated we should not enter these communities directly, but should seek to work with organizations already engaged in these communities that have already established trust. Then when we are gone in three years, they will remain and continue this effort.

Committee Member Krom noted a program like this could be foundational in establishing trust in local elected leaders, a better understanding where their water comes from, and appreciating its value. It will benefit districts as well as communities.

MOVED, approve submittal of a proposal to Department of Water Resources to initiate the Disadvantaged Community Involvement Program in the Santa Ana River Watershed, incorporating modifications specified by the OWOW Steering Committee.

Result:	**Adopted (Passed; 7-2-0)**
Motion/Second:	Harrison/Krom
Ayes:	Ackerman, Ashley, Evans, Hagman, Harrison, Krom, Sullivan
Nays:	Brown, Hessler
Abstentions:	None
Absent:	None

B. New Pillar Chairs (SC#2016.16)

Mike Antos provided a PowerPoint presentation on the OWOW Pillars and their involvement in the OWOW Plan update. Four Pillar Chairs are currently vacant, and three individuals have volunteered to take on these roles:

- Disadvantaged Community/Tribal Pillar – Susan Lien Longville (SBVMWD)
- Natural Resources Stewardship – Jeff Beehler (SBVWCD)
- Stormwater: Resource and Risk Management – Jason Uhley (RCFCWCD)
- Land Use and Water Planning – Vacant; recruiting continues.

Committee Member Evans moved the item, and also suggested that staff seek confirmation from the other Pillar Chairs that they are committed to the schedule and committed to the work.

MOVED, approve three new Pillar chairpersons who have volunteered to assist with the OWOW Plan Update 2018 project.

Result:	**Adopted (Unanimously; 9-0)**
Motion/Second:	Evans/Brown
Ayes:	Ackerman, Ashley, Brown, Evans, Hagman, Harrison, Hessler, Krom, Sullivan
Nays:	None
Abstentions:	None
Absent:	None

C. IRWM Planning Grant Submitted, September 29, 2016 (SC#2016.15)

Mike Antos provided a PowerPoint presentation updating the Committee on the Proposition 1 Planning Grant Proposal submitted by SAWPA on September 29, 2016, which included an overview of the proposed scope of work and budget.

This presentation was for informational purposes only; no action was taken on Agenda Item No. 4.C.

Convener Sullivan recessed the meeting at 12:04 p.m., and convened the meeting at 12:23 p.m.

D. SAWPA Strategic Assessment – One Water One Watershed Business Line (SC#2016.13)

Mark Norton provided a PowerPoint presentation on the One Water One Watershed Business Line. Norton provided a background on the concept of IRWM and the OWOW Plan, and then explained the recent Strategic Assessment facilitation by Paul Brown. The Strategic Assessment was a review by the SAWPA Commission of SAWPA's major functions and activities. Norton reviewed the Purposes and Objectives, Critical Success Factors (CSFs) and associated Processes Activities and Tasks (PATs) developed during the Review. To assist the SAWPA Commission, input from the Committee was requested regarding the Purpose and Objectives and CSFs for the OWOW Business Line.

Distilling and disseminating information throughout the watershed via the SAWPA website was suggested and the benefits discussed.

This presentation was for informational purposes only; no action was taken on Agenda Item No. 4.C.

E. Orange County Stakeholder Activities (SC#2016.17)

Larry McKenney provided an oral report on Orange County stakeholder activities. He noted staff was seeking Committee input on the September 8, 2016 correspondence from the stakeholders, provided in the agenda packet, prior to staff responding to the letter. Representatives of four Orange County agencies have engaged SAWPA staff and commissioners in ongoing discussions advocating reassessment of the OWOW process used to select projects for grant funding. McKenney provided a background of those discussions.

In August 2015, the Orange County Water District (OCWD) Board directed its staff to pursue two approaches: (1) Engage with other stakeholders in discussions with SAWPA about potentially changing the grant funding process; and, (2) During those discussions, begin the process of seeking DWR acceptance of north Orange County as a separate IRWM Region within this same funding region. On July 7, 2016, the Committee was briefed and the specific changes to the Proposition 1 eligibility criteria suggested by the stakeholders were discussed, and staff outlined the changes made through funding rounds to assure IRWM funding is applied to projects that provide watershed-wide benefit and do not cause unreasonable negative impacts elsewhere in the watershed. SAWPA staff believes the changes made in the eligibility criteria have addressed the substantive issues the stakeholders have raised. At the July 2016 meeting, the Committee approved the Proposition 1 OWOW grant eligibility criteria and directed adding a preamble emphasizing the IRWM collaborative effort and goal of watershed-wide benefit. In later correspondence, the Stakeholders have continued to assert the same concerns, and the September 8 letter added new issues. In meetings in Orange County, they have asserted that SAWPA has been unwilling to address their concerns, and they cite that as a reason for continued activity to seek DWR acceptance of a separate IRWM Region within this same funding region. Having multiple IRWMs within the same funding region results in less local control and more State involvement in project selection.

Stakeholders have expressed they do not believe they are receiving their fair share of IRWM grant dollars. Records reflect that projects in Orange County have been allocated twenty-five percent (25%) of the IRWM grant dollars in the Santa Ana funding region that OWOW has allocated. In any event, the physical location of a grant funded project does not fully define where benefits accrue. The OWOW process emphasizes integrated projects with more regional benefits rather than focusing on where the funding is allocated. The IRWM process and funding encourages watershed-wide collaboration.

McKenney noted that the September 8 letter included specific recommended changes in the OWOW Plan. He advised that some of the recommended changes were not appropriate, and that in general amendments to the OWOW Plan should result from the Plan update process with input from stakeholders throughout the region.

Committee Member Krom expressed that the process by which projects are selected and grant funding is allocated should not result in substantively impairing other portions of the watershed, and that is a factor taken into consideration by the Committee. Krom emphasized the importance of staying true to the mission, which is the collaboration, and that she believed the OWOW Steering Committee has been responsive to Orange County's concerns.

Committee Member Krom left the meeting at 1:04 p.m. and did not return.

Marsha Westropp, Senior Planner, OCWD addressed the Committee to clarify two things. First, the OCWD Board directed staff to pursue two options simultaneously: Working with SAWPA on OWOW changes, and also to pursue an option of having their own region. Latest efforts to update the Orange County Plan are a reflection of that second option; it is not a reflection of a lack of progress relative to the first option, which is to continue discussions with SAWPA. There has not been a decision by any of the Orange County stakeholders to pursue the second option of having their own region. Second, to her understanding the September 8th letter was sent from the Orange County stakeholders in response to a request by SAWPA that the OC Stakeholder concerns discussed during these meetings be put in writing. It is not a rejection of the ongoing discussions; it is a "put everything on the table" expression of their concerns so they can be discussed fully. Convener Sullivan thanked Westropp for her clarification. Having been involved in those discussions, Convener Sullivan stated the letter did not include what had been requested. One of the things SAWPA had hoped would be accomplished when requesting the letter was to discuss positive points that could be addressed to make things better moving forward, not simply a restatement of what has occurred over the past five years.

The Committee outlined input and consideration given the stakeholders, including the July 7, 2016 meeting; there was a discussion regarding the importance of watershed-wide collaboration with the Committee receiving input from Peer Swan, Chair, Newport Bay Watershed Executive Committee, representing the interests of the stakeholders. He asserted that the project selection process has lacked transparency, and that SAWPA should facilitate a group of experts from within the watershed to identify the projects that are needed. Swan's emphasis was projects should not adversely impact the lower watershed. Committee Member Sullivan noted significant investments in the hundreds of millions made by upstream water districts within the watershed benefiting the stakeholders with no investment from them. Committee Member Evans, who participated in meetings with the stakeholders, understood the concerns had been addressed previously, and that the Steering Committee had agreed that the concerns should be further discussed in the OWOW Plan update process, not by revisiting the eligibility criteria previously addressed by the Committee. Swan expressed the position of the stakeholders is that they want the ability to provide input on the suite of projects when and if they determine it would adversely impact them.

Committee Member Ashley left the meeting at 1:20 p.m., and did not return.

McKenney recommended the Committee direct staff to continue stakeholder discussions and respond in writing to the September 8 correspondence; the Committee should direct whether or not staff should address what we know about the effort to create a separate IRWM Region. Convener Sullivan suggested we ignore the separate IRWM Region issue, since it is their decision to pursue another option; he expressed his willingness to continue the discussions and agree on a reasonable process that makes this work for the watershed. Committee members were invited to participate in ongoing discussions; Committee Member Brown noted he would be happy to engage in ongoing discussions.

The Committee provided direction to staff; no action was taken on Agenda Item No. 4.E.

5. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting came to a close at 1:46 p.m.

APPROVED: January 27, 2017

Ronald W. Sullivan, Convener

Attest:

Kelly Berry, CMC, Clerk of the Board