



Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority Report from General Managers



August 2017

Discussion Overview

- Background
 - Report Purpose
- Facilitated Process
 - Commission Directives
- Recommendations
 - Communication/Collaboration
 - Business Practices
 - Joint Powers Authority Agreement



Doug Headrick



Mike Markus



John Rossi



Joe Grindstaff



Purpose of Process/Report


- Commission supported facilitated process to discuss and resolve management issues between Member Agencies and SAWPA
- Commission asked GMs to develop and make recommendations
- Goal of recommendations is to assist SAWPA in effectively implementing projects, programs and strategic initiatives



SANTA ANA WATERSHED
PROJECT AUTHORITY

Facilitated Review Process

- Six meetings from April to July facilitated by Sharon Browning
- All five member agency GM's participated in all meetings
- Retired SAWPA GM participated in first meeting and gave valuable perspectives
- Interim SAWPA GM participated in final meeting and provided input on report
- Report and recommendations are consensus of all five member agency General Managers



Tasks

1. Identify SAWPA GM Recruitment Attributes (completed late-May)
2. Establish Planning Premises
3. Develop approaches to strengthen SAWPA GM and Member Agency GM working relationships
4. Address issues with operating provisions of JPAA and identify potential revisions
5. Respond to Governance Questions

Planning Premises


➤ SAWPA...

- is needed and must continue to exist
- implements programs and projects that achieve the collective best interests of the member agencies and others
- fosters collaboration through consensus building
- operates under a commonly understood JPAA




Working Relationships

- Communications / Collaboration Practices
 - Two Way communication pathways
 - Agree to “No Surprises Rule”
- Use existing monthly GM meetings as forum for consensus building
 - Goal is always consensus
 - If no consensus, agree to provide Commission balanced report




SAWPA General Manager Role

- Reports to Commission and leads organization:
 - GMs agree: “...must have broad latitude and authority to manage...”
 - Proposed coordination with GMs: “...not intended in any way to interfere with ...SAWPA GM’s authority..”
- Member Agency GMs and SAWPA GM commitment to working together in the best interests of stakeholders



JPAA Review

- Current JPAA is sound and provides for effective governance
- Recommendation is to better conform business practices to JPAA requirements
 - Project Agreements and Project Committees, as needed
- Implement revisions to both modernize and clarify the JPAA



Conforming Business Practices to JPAA Requirements – Projects

- Jointly identify “Projects” per definition
- Determine those needing Project Agreements
- Identify Project Agreement participants (including outside agencies)
- Develop Project Agreements
- Consistent with June 20, 2017 Commission direction



Conservation Team



JPAA Review – Proposed Clarifying and Modernizing Amendments

- Amend JPAA to clarify certain provisions/terms:
 - General and Project Budgets: “...expenditure and contracting ceiling..”
 - Projects – two types proposed:
 - *SAWPA Projects* (Inland Empire Brine Line, OWOW, etc.)
 - *Watershed Partnership Projects* (task forces, round tables, outside funding partners)
 - Matters of Administration
 - Operating Decisions



JPAA Review – Proposed Clarifying and Modernizing Amendments

- Retain requirement for unanimous Member Agency/Partner approval of budget
- New flexibility provided to increase budget by up to 10% by unanimous Commission approval
 - No requirement for unanimous Member Agency Board approval for up to 10% increase



Recommendations

- Receive feedback from Commission regarding report and recommendations
- Schedule a focused Commission Workshop to discuss and refine the recommendations in the report
- Work with SAWPA General Manager to develop joint work plan to implement recommendations:
 - Practices to strengthen working relationships
 - Conforming JPAA operations (Project Committee/Project Agreements)
 - JPAA amendments



Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority (SAWPA) General Managers
Facilitated Process Report
August 4, 2017

Background and Purpose

In recognition of the need to enhance the relationship among SAWPA and its member agencies, a facilitated issues resolution process was considered in late 2016. After a series of preliminary meetings, the SAWPA Commission authorized and supported such a process on February 21, 2017. The Commission's motion read as follows:

"Support a facilitated process with member agencies to discuss and resolve management issues, sharing in the costs equally with the member agencies, including a report prepared at the conclusion of the process signed off on by all six general managers."

Sharon Browning of Sharon Browning and Associates (SB&A) was hired to facilitate the identified process which started with individual interviews with each of the six general managers. The interviews identified many of the underlying issues that needed to be resolved and a plan was formulated to resolve those issues. A series of meetings was scheduled but before the meetings began, the former SAWPA General Manager announced her retirement. As a result, the process was modified for the first facilitated meeting to ensure her perspectives on the underlying issues were provided.

The original purpose of the General Managers' facilitated process was modified by the Commission on May 2, 2017, to include the following additional tasks:

1. Prior to June 1, 2017, provide input to assist the Commission in developing job description criteria and related information for use in SAWPA's upcoming search for a new General Manager; and
2. Address a list of questions pertaining to SAWPA's business practices, Project Agreements, and budgeting.

Two additional facilitated meetings took place in May where, among other accomplishments, a Purpose Statement was developed, as follows:

"To prepare, for SAWPA Commission consideration, recommendations that will assist SAWPA to effectively implement programs and projects that achieve the member agencies' interests and needs. Specifically, the recommendations will:

- Identify some job performance criteria and desired attributes of a new SAWPA General Manager.
- Strengthen the working relationships between the SAWPA GM and Member Agency GMs.
- Strengthen communications and working relationships among the Member Agency General Managers.

- Affirm, clarify and strengthen the relationship between SAWPA and the Member Agencies.
- Respond to SAWPA Commission questions related to SAWPA business practices, operations under the JPA Agreement and implementation of the One Water One Watershed (OWOW) program.”

In late May, the SAWPA General Manager recruiting attributes and the proposed Purpose Statement were distributed to the Chair of the SAWPA Commission. The receipt of these intermediate work products was acknowledged by the Commission in June.

Four additional facilitated meetings took place in June and July to complete the remaining tasks. As a result of those meetings, this report was drafted and provided to the interim SAWPA GM, Richard Haller, on July 24, 2017. After review and input from Mr. Haller, the final report was completed and transferred to the SAWPA Commission for consideration.

Task 1: Provide a List of Potential Attributes for the Incoming SAWPA General Manager

This list of desirable attributes was prepared in response to the Commission’s request for input to a job description that was being developed for the Commission’s search for a new SAWPA General Manager and, as noted above, the list was delivered to the Commission late-May 2017. This list encompasses key strengths which the General Managers believe are important for the success of the organization and the working relationships with the member agencies and other key stakeholders.

1. Be a consensus builder among the Commissioners.
2. Establish effective peer-to-peer relationships with the member agency GM’s based upon mutual respect and collaboration.
3. Understand and represent member agency needs and interests.¹
4. Embrace a culture of transparency, honesty, and openness in business and interpersonal relationships.
5. Be a strategic thinker who can balance the big-picture watershed objectives of the integrated Regional Watershed Plan with those of the SAWPA member agencies.
6. Effectively and efficiently manage the SAWPA agency’s resources and balance the use of staff and consultants.
7. Foster an internal and external culture of collaboration.

¹ The attributes listed were provided to the Commission as written above in late-May 2017. After further consultation among the member agency General Managers and the SAWPA Interim General Manager, it was mutually agreed that this attribute should be modified to read: “Understand and articulate member agency needs and interests”

8. Be an effective external spokesperson and advocate based upon the SAWPA Commission's established priorities and mission.

Task 2: Establish Planning Premises

The goal of this early task in the process was to determine if the General Managers could agree on a common set of assumptions or guiding principles that could be used as a foundation for working to collaboratively develop recommendations to resolve the issues surrounding SAWPA and as the basis for SAWPA's future operations. In this regard, the following list of "givens" were established:

1. SAWPA is needed and must continue to exist.
2. SAWPA implements programs and projects that achieve the collective best interests of the member agencies while considering the needs of all watershed stakeholders.
3. SAWPA fosters collaboration through consensus decision-making.
4. SAWPA operates under a commonly understood JPAA.

During this task, the General Managers also agreed there needed to be agreement on terms such as "collective best" and "commonly understood." As the balance of the facilitated process unfolded, these items were clarified through the completion of subsequent tasks included in this report.

Task 3: Strengthening Working Relationships among the SAWPA General Manager and the Member Agency General Managers

Some of the key challenges and conflict areas among SAWPA and the member agencies appear to have stemmed from strained working relationships at the executive staff level. To remedy this, the General Managers conducted this task to establish a commonly accepted set of reciprocal practices and protocols to promote coordination, collaboration and professional collegiality among the member agency General Managers, the SAWPA General Manager and the agencies' staff.

It is important to note that the member agency General Managers clearly understand that the SAWPA General Manager must have broad latitude and authority to manage the day-to-day operations of the organization. Accordingly, the practices and protocols proposed herein are not intended in any way to interfere with, or circumvent, the SAWPA General Manager's authority and responsibilities to the Commission. Rather, the goal is to create a mechanism to better support the SAWPA General Manager and to improve coordination and achieve consensus at the staff level on important issues going to the Commission.

The recommended practices and procedures for strengthening the important working relationships among the General Managers and staff are divided into three key topic areas of Communications, Collaboration and Business Practices:

1. Communications

- a. Member agency General Managers shall inform the SAWPA General Manager and the other member agency General Managers if the member agency or its Commissioner has concerns or issues with any item going to a Commission meeting, a committee or the OWOW Steering Committee.
 - i. The communication should be prior to the meeting and preferably, the posting of the agenda.
- b. Ensure member agencies General Managers are informed about substantive meetings and/or conversations the SAWPA General Manager has with the agencies' respective Commissioners.
- c. Member agency General Managers shall be consulted about meetings or actions SAWPA conducts with outside agencies that materially affect that member agency's interests.

2. Collaboration

- a. Significant agenda items being taken to the Commission, a committee or the OWOW Steering Committee shall be shared with and discussed among with the SAWPA General Manager and the member agency General Managers.
- b. If there are fundamental disagreements on items being brought to the Commission, a committee or the OWOW Steering Committee, best efforts will be made among the SAWPA General Manager and the member agency General Managers to develop a mutually acceptable consensus recommendation.
- c. Once consensus is reached at the General Manager level on specific agenda items:
 - i. The staff of SAWPA and the member agencies will support the consensus recommendation; and
 - ii. The member agency General Managers will convey the consensus recommendations to their respective Commissioners.
- d. If consensus cannot be reached on a specific item:
 - i. The SAWPA staff will represent opposing points of view in a factual and balanced manner, along with the SAWPA staff recommendation; and
 - ii. The member agency General Managers will convey to their respective Commissioners the opposing points of view in a factual and balanced manner, along with their recommendation.

3. Business Practices

- a. Monthly meetings between the SAWPA General Manager and the member agency General Managers shall be conducted. Agendas shall be prepared in advance and circulated for revisions or additions. Agendas shall include, but not necessarily be limited to the following:
 - i. A review of an advanced calendar of proposed agenda items for the Commission, committee meetings and the OWOW Steering Committee for the upcoming month.

- ii. Significant agenda items (excluding those being considered in closed session) would be discussed among the SAWPA General Manager and member agency General Managers before they are published on any agenda.²
 - iii. A review of any new initiatives, programs, task forces or other similar activities SAWPA intends to develop and implement, with an opportunity for the member agency General Managers to provide input.
- b. SAWPA staff reports for significant items being considered by the Commission, committees or the OWOW Steering Committee shall include:
- i. The SAWPA General Manager and staff recommendations;
 - ii. The consensus recommendation of the SAWPA General Manager and member agency General Managers; or
 - iii. Varying points of view where there may not be consensus stated in a factual and balanced manner without attribution.

To ensure the interaction between the member agencies and the SAWPA General Manager is efficient, effective and not overly burdensome, this task also included clearly defining what are considered “significant agenda items” that require advanced review and discussion among the agencies. The goal is to improve coordination and achieve consensus at the staff level on important issues going to the Commission while, as previously noted, leaving the SAWPA General Manager broad latitude to manage the day-to-day activities of the organization.

Accordingly, the recommended list of significant agenda items that the SAWPA General Manager would share and discuss with the member agency General Managers would be limited to those items going to the SAWPA Commission for review or action. These include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following:

1. Significant Financial Items

- a. Budgets (Project Budgets and SAWPA General Budget).
- b. Planning, engineering, and construction contracts and related change orders.
- c. Changes to Brine Line rates, charges and administration affecting the Member Agencies or their customers.

2. Significant Administration and Personnel Items

- a. Proposals for salary ranges or benefit changes including any Classification and Compensation studies.

² In compliance with the Brown Act, any agenda items for a Project Committee on which a majority of the member agency General Managers serve would not be subject to review and discussion at the SAWPA General Manager’s meeting.

- b. Proposals to increase staffing.
 - c. Proposals to modify any SAWPA governance related document including, but not limited to, the JPAA and Project Agreements.
 - d. All formal positions proposed to be taken on pending or approved legislation or regulations.
3. Projects and Initiatives
- a. Any new initiative, program, task force, or proposal for funding that promotes or expands SAWPA activities including the needs of other stakeholders for such programs.

Task 4: Implementation of Operating Provisions of the JPAA and Areas for Potential Revision

The purpose of this task was to directly address the on-going concerns some member agencies have with SAWPA's current operations under the JPAA. Additionally, this task also involved answering the question: should the JPAA be changed, and if so, how?

After review of the JPAA and SAWPA's Strategic Plan and business practices, the General Managers found that the basic structure of the JPAA is sound and provides a governance structure that, if properly implemented, promotes member agency collaboration, commitment and accountability.

Consistent with the direction from the Commission at SAWPA's June 20, 2017, meeting the General Managers recommend the following collaborative steps to conform SAWPA's business operations to the JPAA:

1. *Identification of Projects:* Staffs of SAWPA and the member agencies to jointly identify the various activities of which SAWPA is engaged that meet the criteria of not being preliminary studies or matters of general administration, and either directly or indirectly expose the member agencies or their customers to costs. This list should be presented to the Commission to clarify what constitutes a "Project" for the purposes of the JPAA.
2. *Determining Projects Requiring Project Agreements:* Jointly identify those specific activities for which the Commission has formally identified as "projects" and has executed project agreements and where appropriate, established project committees. Activities in this category include task forces or round tables that have existing project agreements with all SAWPA or some of the SAWPA member agencies and external stakeholders (e.g. Basin Monitoring Program Task Force).

Jointly identify the remaining activities that meet the criteria of a "project" but have neither a project agreement nor a project committee, and determine the type of project agreement and/or project committee that would be applicable (see Task 4 Section 2a, below) and/or if some of those activities (i.e. task forces or round tables) can be logically grouped into a single project. Present the recommended new "projects," consistent with the JPAA requirements, and associated staff and resource needs to the Commission for review and consideration.

3. *Identification of Project Committees and Participating Agencies:* Based upon the “projects” identified, determine which agencies are participants in the various activities and projects, and if less than all the member agencies are participating in a “project,” identify the need for a project committee consistent with the requirements of the JPAA.
4. *Implementation:* Upon the identification of the “projects” and project committees that require formation, prepare all requisite project agreements and seek member agency approval of such agreements and designation of project committee members, where appropriate. Format future Commission meeting agendas to identify and segregate actions for each active “project” and the members voting on a project-related item. The intent would be to conduct all Project Committee business involving the Commission as part of the agendas for the two regularly scheduled monthly Commission meetings.

Additionally, to provide certainty for the member agencies and SAWPA and to improve efficiency, the General Managers recommend consideration by the Commission of potential revisions to modernize and clarify the JPAA. Any amendments to the JPAA would need to be drafted and reviewed by the legal counsels of SAWPA and the member agencies, and would require unanimous approval by the member agencies’ Boards of Directors.

Proposed amendments to the JPAA are as follows:

1. A clear and unambiguous definition of “Budget” in the JPAA as an expenditure and contracting ceiling.
2. A refined definition of a “Project” in the JPAA for purposes of administration by a Project Agreement and Project Committee to include two project categories:
 - a. *SAWPA Projects* – These would include all capital and operating assets such as the Brine Line, task forces or programs that are governed by SAWPA members only, and the OWOW and Integrated Regional Watershed Management Plan and program.
 - b. *Watershed Partnership Projects* – These would include task forces with SAWPA member agency participants that are also funded by outside partners of which SAWPA desires to include in Project Committee governance.
3. A more detailed definition in the JPAA of “Matters of Administration” as activities relating to general administration and support such as financial functions, payroll, audit and accounting support, administrative facility operations and maintenance, staff training, state advocacy support, Commission support, website maintenance and other similar functions. Matters not included in this category would be Projects subject to Project Agreements.
4. A more detailed definition in the JPAA of “Operating Decisions” that affect member agencies or their customers’ interests and require unanimous approval of the Commission or a SAWPA Project Committee. Such decisions would typically include major changes in facility or project operations or major construction that would materially affect the use of an operating asset by

one or more of the SAWPA member agencies or their customers. It is understood that Operating Decisions as defined herein exclude emergency actions.

For administering the General Budget, further clarification plus a revision to allow more flexibility for the Commission to authorize budget augmentation without separate member agency authorization as follows:

- a. Once the General Budget is unanimously approved by the Member Agencies, expenditures or contracts within the approved Budget may be authorized by majority vote of the Commission.
 - b. Expenditures or contracts for amounts of up to 10% over the approved General Budget may be authorized by unanimous vote of the Commission.³
 - c. Expenditures or contracts for amounts in excess of 10% over the approved General Budget may only be authorized by unanimous approval of the Member Agencies.
5. For administering Project Budgets, clarification and revision, as follows:
- a. Once a Project Budget is unanimously approved by the Member Agencies (or the Member Agencies and outside partners, in the case of Watershed Partnership Projects), expenditures or contracts within the approved Budget may be authorized by majority vote of the Commission, SAWPA Project Committee (if the Project involves less than all Member Agencies), or Watershed Partnership Project Committee (if the Project involves less than all Member Agencies and outside partners).
 - b. Similar to the proposed revision for the General Budget, expenditures or contracts for amounts of up to 10% over the approved Project Budget may be authorized by unanimous vote of the Commission, SAWPA Project Committee, or Watershed Partnership Project Committee, depending on the type of Project Agreement.
 - c. Expenditures or contracts for amounts in excess of 10% over the approved Project Budget may be only be authorized by unanimous approval of the Member Agencies, or the Member Agencies and outside partners in the case of Watershed Partnership Projects.

Existing SAWPA provisions for emergency expenditures under the General Budget or Project Budgets would not be altered by the proposed JPAA revisions recommended above.

The General Managers believe the proposed revisions to the JPAA outlined herein would help provide a clear and commonly understood basis for operating under the JPAA while improving operational efficiency and maintaining the key elements of accountability and financial transparency that the original JPAA structure is intended to provide.

³ Currently, any expenditures in excess of the approved budget would require separate authorization by each member agency. This proposal is intended to provide additional flexibility and administrative streamlining.

Task 5 - Responses to Governance Questions Distributed by the SAWPA Chair regarding SAWPA's Business Practices and Joint Powers Authority Agreement (JPAA)

This final task involved providing responses to a series of questions distributed by the SAWPA Chair on May 2, 2017. Some of the responses to these questions are also reflected in the recommendations developed under previous tasks. The verbatim questions as presented to the General Managers are shown in *italics*, below, with the General Managers' response following.

1. *Is a member agency experiencing harm from SAWPA's current business practices?
a. (Are member agencies being obligated involuntarily for member agency contribution?)*

Yes. Expenses for activities that are "chargeable" and impose "any financial liability" on member agencies appear to have been approved out of compliance with the Project Agreement, Project Committee and voting provisions of the Joint Powers Authority Agreement (JPAA). Section 7 of the JPAA explicitly states that "*except for budget items*" each member agency has absolute discretion to "approve or disapprove prior to commitment."

The concept of a member agency only being required to approve an item if it is being "*obligated involuntarily for member agency contribution*" is not delineated anywhere in the JPAA. However, the requirement for unanimous member agency approval extends to "any financial liability" without distinguishing between the voluntary and involuntary nature of such expenses.

2. *How should the SAWPA general budget be approved?*

Because SAWPA is a five member Joint Powers entity and items in the general budget are chargeable to the member agencies, the budget should continue to be approved by unanimous decision of the member agencies. It is further recommended that once a general budget is approved by the member agencies, that increases to the general budget of up to 10% over the originally approved budget amount could be approved by unanimous vote of the Commission (See Task 4, Section 5, above, for further explanation). Increases to the budget in excess of 10% would still require unanimous approval of the member agencies. Additionally, it is recommended that any previously awarded pass-through grant funding to grant award recipients that is included in the SAWPA General Budget would not be withheld as a result of non-approval of the SAWPA budget by one or more of the member agencies. It should be noted that these clarifications would require revision to the JPAA.

3. *What is the purpose of Project Agreements?*

The purpose of a Project Agreement is to ensure that budgets, financial obligations and operating decisions associated with a specific project that involves less than all the members

are approved only by those members. It is also to ensure that non-participating member agencies are not exposed to project liabilities or expenses.

4. *What are the essential elements of a Project Agreement?*

The essential elements of a Project Agreement should include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following items: Definition of the project's scope; Project Committee membership (if less than all the member agencies); a clarification of project liabilities; statement of JPAA voting procedures for budgets, financial obligations and operating decisions relative to the project; allocation of project and administrative costs; and definition of SAWPA staff participation.

5. *What authority should Project Committees have?*

Project Committees should have full authority to make any and all project decisions on behalf of the participants. Voting procedures shall be accordance with the JPAA with the approval of budgets and operating decisions being made on a unanimous basis.

6. *Who should Project Committee representatives be?*

SAWPA Project Committee members should be Commissioners or General Managers, at the sole discretion of the participating agency. Member agencies are sophisticated and are aware that their appointed Project Committee members – whether a Commissioner or General Manager – are making decisions that obligate the member agency. There are some projects that are more technical in nature and the Project Committee may wish to obtain the input from an Ad Hoc Technical Work Group, which could be made up of member agency designated staff or others, as necessary.

Under separate cover, it is recommended that two types of Project Committee be defined in the JPAA: SAWPA Project Committees and Watershed Partnership Project Committees. The representatives and membership in the former is described, above. The membership of Watershed Partnership Project Committees would include SAWPA member agencies and outside funding partners, and representation on the committees would include Commissioners or General Managers from the member agency participants, and one designated representative from each outside partner.

7. *How should enterprise-funded activities be handled by the Commission?*

The JPAA and project committee format is fully compatible with a variety of funding sources and there is no apparent need for distinguishing between enterprise-funded and non-enterprise funded activities. To the extent an activity involves less than all the SAWPA agencies, any enterprise-type assessments or rates that are used to fund the activity should be voted on and approved unanimously by the affected member agencies. If the activity involves all SAWPA member agencies, any assessments or rates and charges that are used to fund the enterprise should be voted on and approved unanimously by the Commission.

Although an enterprise activity such as the brine line may involve external agencies or users, this activity has been developed and managed by SAWPA and, therefore, should be governed by the SAWPA Commission or SAWPA Project Committee, as appropriate.

8. *How should the Commission make decisions about actions implementing an approved budget?*

Once the budget is unanimously approved (whether General Budget or a Project Budget), expenditures from the approved budget should continue to be made by majority vote. However, no expenditure shall be approved for unbudgeted items or for contracting that exceeds the approved budget (either General Budget or Project Budget) without unanimous consent of the Commission or Project Committee.

9. *To implement OWOW, does SAWPA comprise the appropriate member agencies?*

Yes. The five member agencies are regional in nature and geographically represent the entire three-county watershed. Integrated Regional Watershed Management Plans (IRWMPs) in other areas of the State are typically managed by only one regional agency (a single regional water authority, flood control agency, County, etc.).

Having five agencies implement the IRWMP through the OWOW process provides a base level of regional agency diversity. In an effort to ensure further stakeholder participation, SAWPA has established a Steering Committee that includes county, city, NGO and other non-SAWPA representatives. The Steering Committee's recommendations have been duly considered and for the most part, uniformly ratified by the Commission. As such, there is no compelling argument that the current governance structure for OWOW needs revision or that SAWPA's governance needs to change for this purpose.

Conclusion and Recommended Next Steps

This report includes a series of recommendations regarding practices to improve relationships among the agencies' General Managers, conforming SAWPA's operations to the JPAA through the formation and implementation of Project Agreements and Project Committees, and development and approval of a series of amendments and clarifications to the JPAA. Most of the recommendations to strengthen the working relationships among SAWPA and the member agency management teams are administrative and nature and can be implemented immediately at the staff level. These practices should be put in place as soon as practicable and evaluated by the General Managers on an annual basis to determine effectiveness and to identify opportunities for continuous improvement.

Effectuating the recommendations to establish Project Agreements and Project Committees and to amend and clarify the JPAA will require discussion, review and approval among the Commission and the member agencies' management teams, legal counsels and governing bodies. The General Managers recommend that a consensus Implementation Plan be developed jointly among SAWPA and the member agencies' management staff that details the steps and actions necessary for implementation. This plan would be presented to the Commission for review and direction to move forward.

This report is respectfully submitted to the Commission for its review and consideration and represents the consensus views of the SAWPA member agency General Managers in consultation with the SAWPA General Manager. As noted herein, the General Managers firmly believe SAWPA is needed and must continue to exist as a healthy organization that achieves the collective best interests of the member agencies, while providing substantial benefits to the entire Santa Ana River Watershed. This is best accomplished through consensus decision-making and collaborative, productive and collegial working relationships between the SAWPA staff, Commissioners and the member agencies. When it works - it works well, and it is the goal of the General Managers in developing this report to provide recommendations that will improve and optimize the organization and its overall effectiveness.



Basin Monitoring Program Task Force

Recomputation of Current Ambient Water Quality in Groundwater Management Zones SAWPA Commission Meeting

August 15, 2017




Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.

Objective

The Basin Plan requires the implementation of a watershed-wide monitoring program to:

- determine ambient water quality in groundwater
- assess compliance with groundwater quality objectives, and
- determine if assimilative capacity exists in groundwater management zones.



Background

- In 1995, a Task Force was formed to study the impacts that salt and nitrate have on the long-term sustainability of groundwater supply. The Task Force including the Regional Board:
 - revised groundwater basin boundaries
 - set new water quality objectives based on a better data set
 - developed a rigorous scientific method for computing the volume-weighted ambient water quality





Groundwater Management Zone Boundaries and AWQ Objectives

Explanation

Riverside-A	Groundwater Management Zone
560	TDS Objective (mg/L)
6.2	NO ₃ -N Objective (mg/L)

*SWO: Surface Water Objectives Apply
 N/A: Not enough data were available to calculate water quality objectives.

-  RWQCB Boundary
-  Groundwater Management Zone Boundary
-  Recharge Basin
-  Rivers and Streams
-  WWTP Discharge Locations



Current - 1996 to 2015 - Recomputation

- Data compilation
- QA/QC, process, and upload recent historical data
- Calculate water quality point statistics
- Draw groundwater elevation and water quality contour maps
- Digitize contours and using geospatial tools, estimate volume-weighted ambient water quality in each groundwater management zone



Location of Wells with Nitrate Data

Explanation


- 1996-2015 Point Statistic TDS
- 1996-2015 Average TDS

Note: As requested by CBWM, private well locations used in the 1996-2015 AWQ recomputation are not shown.

- ▭ RWQCB Boundary
- ▭ Groundwater Management Zone Boundary
- ☪ Recharge Basin
- ~ Rivers and Streams

0 5 10 Miles

N



Location of Wells with TDS Data

Explanation

- 1996-2015 Point Statistic NO₃-N
- 1996-2015 Average NO₃-N

Note: As requested by CBWM, private well locations used in the 1996-2015 AWQ recomputation are not shown.


- RWQCB Boundary
- Groundwater Management Zone Boundary
- Recharge Basin
- ~ Rivers and Streams



N



0 5 10 Miles



Volume of Groundwater in GMZs

Explanation

-  RWQCB Boundary
-  Groundwater Management Zone Boundary
-  Recharge Basin
-  Rivers and Streams


Volume of Groundwater Storage

-  < 1,000 acre-ft
-  10,000 acre-ft
-  > 20,000 acre-ft
-  No calculated volume in storage

Note: Grid cell size is 400 x 400 meters



0 5 10 Miles

Ambient Water Quality - Nitrate (1996 to 2015)

Explanation


Riverside-A 5.6 Groundwater Management Zone
NO₃-N AWQ 1996-2015 (mg/L)

*SWO: Surface Water Objectives Apply


N/A: Not enough data were available to calculate AWQ values.

-  RWQCB Boundary
-  Groundwater Management Zone Boundary
-  Recharge Basin
-  Rivers and Streams

NO₃-N Concentration (mg/L)



Note: Grid cell size is 400 x 400 meters. For layered GMZs (Orange County, Chino-North, & Bunker-Hill Pressure Zones) the volume weighted concentrations are calculated and displayed.



Ambient Water Quality - TDS (1996 to 2015)


Explanation

Riverside-A 440 Groundwater Management Zone
 440 TDS AWQ 1996-2015 (mg/L)


*SWO: Surface Water Objectives Apply

N/A: Not enough data were available to calculate AWQ values.

-  RWQCB Boundary
-  Groundwater Management Zone Boundary
-  Recharge Basin
-  Rivers and Streams



Note: Grid cell size is 400 x 400 meters. For layered GMZs (Orange County, Chino-North, & Bunker-Hill Pressure Zones) the volume weighted concentrations are calculated and displayed.



Nitrate AWQ Change (2012 to 2015)


Explanation

Riverside-A 0.2 Groundwater Management Zone
NO₃-N AWQ Change (mg/L)


*SWO: Surface Water Objectives Apply
N/A: Not enough data were available
to calculate AWQ change

-  RWQCB Boundary
-  Groundwater Management Zone Boundary
-  Recharge Basin
-  Rivers and Streams

NO₃-N Concentration Change (2015-2012)



Note: Grid cell size is 400 x 400 meters
For layered GMZs (Orange County, Chino-North, & Bunker-Hill Pressure Zones) the volume weighted concentrations are calculated and displayed.




TDS AWQ Change (2012 to 2015)

Explanation


Riverside-A 20 Groundwater Management Zone
TDS AWQ Change (mg/L)

*SWO: Surface Water Objectives Apply
N/A: Not enough data were available to calculate AWQ change

-  RWQCB Boundary
-  Groundwater Management Zone Boundary
-  Recharge Basin
-  Rivers and Streams



Note: Grid cell size is 400 x 400 meters
For layered GMZs (Orange County, Chino-North, & Bunker-Hill Pressure Zones) the volume weighted concentrations are calculated and displayed.






Attachment Contents:

- B6-1 Groundwater Storage and Elevation Contours Fall 2015
- B6-2 NO₃-N Concentration and Contour Map
- B6-3 TDS Concentration and Contour Map
- B6-4 NO₃-N Concentration Change (2015-2012)
- B6-5 TDS Concentration Change (2015-2012)
- B6-6 Key Well Analysis Charts

	Basin Analytics	Chino-East	Chino-South
Basin	GMZ Area (acres)	7,950	13,100
	Volume of storage (acre-ft)	80,100	187,000
NO ₃ -N	Wells per GMZ	499	178
	Statistics per GMZ	271	51
	Total Mass (tons)	2,400	7,060
	1996-2015 AWQ	22	27.8
TDS	Wells per GMZ	205	125
	Statistics per GMZ	29	25
	Total Mass (tons)	91,500	239,000
	1996-2015 AWQ	840	940

Table 1 - Basin Analytics



Nitrate as Nitrogen (Nitrate or NO₃-N)

Chino South

The nitrate objective for Chino South is 4.2 mg/L. The ambient nitrate concentration decreased from 28.0 mg/L in 2012 to 27.8 mg/L in 2015, and there is no assimilative capacity. One out of the five key wells in Chino South GMZ have an increasing trend in nitrate concentrations, three key wells show a decreasing trend, and the other one shows no trend in the nitrate concentrations. Seven of the total 178 wells with nitrate values in Chino South will not be eligible for the next AWQ recomputation if the well is not sampled prior to 2018. No new wells with statistics were added to the 1996 to 2015 AWQ recomputation and nineteen wells that were sampled between 2014 and 2015 will be eligible to have statistics determined, if the wells are sampled again in the next AWQ recomputation period (1999-2018).

Chino East

The nitrate objective for Chino East is 10.0 mg/L. The ambient nitrate concentration increased from 21.0 mg/L in 2012 to 22.0 mg/L in 2015, and there is no assimilative capacity. Two out of the five key wells in Chino East GMZ have a decreasing trend in nitrate concentrations, while the other three shows no trends in the nitrate concentrations. Thirteen of the total 499 wells with nitrate values in Chino East will not be eligible for the next AWQ recomputation if the well is not sampled prior to 2018. Forty-two new wells with statistics were added to the 1996 to 2015 AWQ recomputation and sixty-nine wells that were sampled between 2014 and 2015 will be eligible to have statistics determined, if the wells are sampled again in the next AWQ recomputation period (1999-2018).

Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)

Chino South

The TDS objective for Chino South is 680 mg/L. The ambient TDS concentration decreased from 990 mg/L in 2012 to 940 mg/L in 2015, and there is no assimilative capacity. Two out of the five key interpretive wells in Chino South GMZ show a decreasing trend while the other three show no trends in TDS concentrations. Five of the total 125 wells with TDS values in Chino South will not be eligible for the next AWQ recomputation if not sampled prior to 2018. No new wells with statistics were added to the 1996 to 2015 AWQ recomputation, and nineteen wells that were sampled between 2014 and 2015 will be eligible to have statistics determined, if the wells are sampled again in the next AWQ recomputation period (1999-2018).

Interpretive Tools

GMZ	Well ID	Well Name	NO ₃ -N (mg/L)	NO ₃ -N Trend	TDS (mg/L)	TDS Trend
Chino-East	1003583	03A	21.5	No Trend	--	--
Chino-East	1206966	II-6	24.7	No Trend	609	No Trend
Chino-East	1207150	CTP-TW1	25.9	No Trend	977	Decreasing
Chino-East	1207986	HCMP-9/1	12.2	Decreasing	734	Decreasing
Chino-East	1207998	HCMP-9/2	0.2	Decreasing	178	No Trend
Chino-South	1003624	JCSD 01 (Sky Country #1)	10.0	Increasing	731	No Trend
Chino-South	1003663	9	1.5	Decreasing	601	No Trend
Chino-South	1206968	II-8	15.7	Decreasing*	800	Decreasing**
Chino-South	1207985	HCMP-8/1	61.9	Decreasing	1,354	Decreasing
Chino-South	1207997	HCMP-8/2	3.3	No Trend	225	No Trend

* significant trend **very significant trend

Table 2 - Key Interpretive Wells

Mann-Kendall trend analyses on the annualized average concentrations for wells that have been identified as key interpretive wells was used to determine the significance of the trends in well concentrations. See Key Well Analysis Charts for more details. See Attachment B6-4 and B6-5 for NO₃-N and TDS well locations, respectively.

GMZ	Well Information			NO ₃ -N Well Attrition				TDS Well Attrition			
	Well ID	Well Name		Risk	Years ¹	Value ²	Method	Risk	Years ¹	Value ²	Method
Chino-East	1003513	JCSD 05		High	1	8.8	Ave	--	--	--	--
Chino-East	1003582	03		High	2	20.6	Ave	--	--	--	--
Chino-East	1207144	AGA4875		High	1	4.4	Ave	--	--	--	--
Chino-East	1207145	AGA4915		High	2	5.0	Ave	--	--	--	--
Chino-East	1207146	AGA4930		Medium	3	5.9	Stat	--	--	--	--
Chino-East	1207147	AGA5040		High	2	7.0	Ave	--	--	--	--
Chino-East	1207181	FC-249A3		Medium	2	8.6	Ave	Medium	2	966	Ave
Chino-East	1207202	FC-5A3		Medium	1	5.7	Ave	Medium	1	837	Ave
Chino-East	1207241	LEM-4A		Medium	1	5.2	Ave	--	--	--	--
Chino-East	1207264	PED5029		High	3	9.3	Stat	--	--	--	--
Chino-East	1207265	PED5071		Medium	2	9.4	Ave	--	--	--	--
Chino-East	1207266	PYR3851		Medium	2	2.2	Ave	--	--	--	--
Chino-East	1207270	PYR4352		Medium	1	0.0	Ave	--	--	--	--
Chino-East	1207272	STN4800		Medium	3	5.8	Stat	--	--	--	--
Chino-East	1207393	60TH8792		Medium	1	4.5	Ave	--	--	--	--
Chino-East	1207407	PED4931		Medium	3	4.5	Stat	--	--	--	--
Chino-East	1207408	PED5106		Medium	3	23.3	Stat	--	--	--	--
Chino-East	1207409	PED5151		Medium	1	5.2	Ave	--	--	--	--
Chino-East	1207410	PED5261		High	1	36.1	Ave	--	--	--	--
Chino-East	1207411	PED5424		Medium	1	7.2	Ave	--	--	--	--
Chino-East	1207412	STN4992		Medium	1	5.2	Ave	--	--	--	--
Chino-East	1208835	LC-4B		High	2	0.0	Ave	--	--	--	--
Chino-East	1208836	OW-62D		High	1	4.8	Ave	--	--	--	--
Chino-East	1208837	OW-63D		High	1	4.6	Ave	--	--	--	--
Chino-East	1208877	FC-738A2		--	10	15.8	Stat	Medium	2	1,039	Ave
Chino-East	1208895	LE-109A		Medium	1	5.3	Ave	--	--	--	--
Chino-East	1208902	OW-63A		Medium	2	5.9	Ave	--	--	--	--
Chino-East	1208903	OW-64A		Medium	1	3.8	Ave	--	--	--	--
Chino-East	1208904	OW-65A		Medium	2	4.1	Ave	--	--	--	--
Chino-South	1003611	NOR 09		High	1	0.1	Ave	High	1	468	Ave
Chino-South	1003612	NOR 10		High	1	10.6	Ave	--	--	--	--
Chino-South	1003630	07		High	2	12.1	Ave	--	--	--	--
Chino-South	1202703	60H		Medium	1	84.9	Ave	Medium	1	1,160	Ave
Chino-South	1207394	60TH9709		Medium	1	5.9	Ave	--	--	--	--
Chino-South	1207398	60TH9957		Medium	1	9.5	Ave	--	--	--	--
Chino-South	1207399	60TH9989		Medium	1	8.1	Ave	--	--	--	--
Chino-South	1207402	APP6111		Medium	1	3.2	Ave	--	--	--	--

¹ number of years with samples ² final value used to contour well concentrations -- not applicable

Table 3 - Well Attrition Analysis

The well locations above have been identified as locations likely to be lost in future AWQ recomputation studies. High Risk wells will be lost during the 1999-2018 study period if not sampled before 2018. Medium Risk wells will be lost during the 2002-2021 study period if not sampled before 2021. See Attachment B6-4 and B6-5 for NO₃-N and TDS well locations, respectively. As requested by Chino Basin Water Master, private well locations used in the 1996-2015 AWQ recomputation are not shown.

Portion of the TDS AWQ Table

Groundwater Management Zone	Total Dissolved Solids Concentration (mg/L)									
	Water Quality Objective	Historical Ambient	1997 Ambient	2003 Ambient	2006 Ambient	2009 Ambient	2012 Ambient	2015 Ambient	Difference from 2012 to 2015	Assimilative Capacity
<i>Chino, Rialto/Colton, and Riverside Basins</i>										
Chino-North, "max benefit"	420	260	300	320	340	340	350	360	10	60
Chino 1, "antideg"	280	280	310	330	340	340	350	350	0	-70
Chino 2, "antideg"	250	250	300	340	360	360	380	380	0	-130
Chino 3, "antideg"	260	260	280	280	310	320	320	320	0	-60
Chino-East	730	733	760	620	650	770	770	840	70	-110
Chino-South	680	676	720	790	940	980	990	940	-50	-260
Colton	410	407	430	430	450	430	440	480	40	-70
Cucamonga, "max benefit"	380	212	260	250	250	250	260	260	0	120
Cucamonga, "antideg"	210	212	260	250	250	250	260	260	0	-50
Rialto	230	230	230	220	230	230	230	240	10	-10
Riverside-A	560	560	440	440	440	430	420	440	20	120
Riverside-B	290	289	320	310	340	340	340	360	20	-70
Riverside-C	680	684	760	750	740	740	730	?	?	?
Riverside-D	810	812	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
Riverside-E	720	721	720	700	710	700	740	730	-10	-10
Riverside-F	660	665	580	570	570	570	560	560	0	100



Benefits of Ambient WQ Recomputation

- Powerful tool to assist the stakeholders in managing the water resources in the Santa Ana Watershed:
 - aids the Regional Board in identifying TDS and nitrate trends the assessment of assimilative capacity is critical in permitting projects, such as groundwater replenishment reuse project
 - assists the stakeholders in identifying areas of potential concern
 - supports Santa Ana River wasteload allocation and discharge permits
 - collaboration of stakeholders and Regional Board



Questions?



Disadvantaged Community Involvement (DCI) Program


Proposed new partner:
University of California, Irvine



OWOW Program Approach

1. Strengths and Needs Assessment
2. Education and Engagement
3. Project Development

- Disadvantaged / Tribal Community Pillar
- Technical Advisory Committee



DCI Program Design



- Grant dollars in Program Element 1 and PE 3
 - Designed to be allocated to needed / eligible items during the project
 - As strengths & needs are uncovered, the TAC will recommend to Steering Committee for allocation.
 - SAWPA Commission ultimately responsible for Grant Administration



UC Irvine



Water **UCI**

- Drs. Valarie Olsen and Emily Brooks
 - Department of Anthropology
 - Center for Ethnography – home of the Community Knowledge Project
 - Water UCI – initiative supporting interdisciplinary research on water science, technology, management and policy.



UC Irvine



Water **UCI**

- Training DCI partners on effective engagement methods
 - Developing written guide for future use
- Preserving community knowledge by archiving water stories collected during the DCI Program.
- Building and maintaining relationships of trust between community members and water practitioners.
- Identifying community-scale variables of strengths, needs, and values related to water.
- Cataloging effective ways for water agencies to partner with community groups



Recommendation

- Following the action of the OWOW Steering Committee, it is recommended that the Commission direct the Interim General Manager to negotiate and execute a subagreement, not to exceed \$105,000, with University of California Irvine as a partner to the Disadvantaged Community Involvement Program.




Inland Empire Brine Line
Reach V Rehabilitation and
Improvement Project – Phase 1

Item 5.D.

August 15, 2017

Segment Summary



Segment #	CIPP	Pressure Test	Labs
Reach 2			
1 - 4	Lined	✓	✓
5.	No Lining	N/A	N/A
6.	Lined	✓	✓
7.	Lined	✓	✓
8.	Lined	✓	Pending
9.	Lined	✓	Pending
9.1	Complete Remove and Replace 70 ft		
10.	Lined	Pending	Pending
11.	8/16		
11.B	Lined	Pending	Pending
12.	Lined	Pending	Pending
13.	Lined	Pending	Pending
14.	Lined	✓	✓
15.	Complete Remove and Replace 395 ft		
16.	8/21		
17.	8/23		



8/8/17 1:32:37 PM PDT



8/11/17 9:25:00 AM PDT



Questions?

Ovality Results

	<u>Segment #</u>	<u>Length</u>	<u>Ovality Range</u>	<u>Action</u>
Reach 2	▪ 1.	500 ft	2.5% - 9.5%	CIPP Line
	▪ 2.	450 ft	2.3% - 9.4%	CIPP Line
	▪ 3.	550 ft	1.3% - 11.5%	CIPP Line
	▪ 4.	350 ft	1.5% - 8.0%	CIPP Line
	▪ 5.	350 ft	1.4% - 3.9%	No Lining
	▪ 6.	400 ft	1.3% - 9.0%	CIPP Line
	▪ 7.	350 ft	1.0% - 7.5%	CIPP Line
	▪ 8.	410 ft	1.5% - 10.4%	CIPP Line
	▪ 9.	410 ft	1.6% - 10.0%	CIPP Line
	▪ 9.1	70 ft	6.0% - 16.5%	Remove and Replace
	▪ 10.	220 ft	1.6% - 7.7%	CIPP Line
	▪ 11.	270 ft	0.7% - 9.0%	CIPP Line
	▪ 11B.	440 ft	0.7% - 9.0%	CIPP Line
	▪ 12.	240 ft	1.5% - 12.0%	CIPP Line
	▪ 13.	460 ft	4.0% - 18.0%	CIPP Line (Increased wall thickness at 18% Ovality, 9ft)
▪ 14.	405 ft	3.6% - 13.5%	CIPP Line	
▪ 15.	395 ft	3.3% - 16.1%	Remove and Replace	

Ovality Results

	<u>Segment #</u>	<u>Length</u>	<u>Ovality Range</u>	<u>Action</u>
	▪ 16.	400 ft	2.9% - 11.2%	CIPP Line
	▪ 17.	350 ft	3.2% - 12.4%	CIPP Line
	▪ 18.	350 ft	1.4% - 12.0%	CIPP Line
	▪ 19.	510 ft	1.0% - 8.0%	CIPP Line
	▪ 20.	270 ft	2.2% - 8.0%	CIPP Line
	▪ 21.	470 ft	0.6% - 7.0%	CIPP Line
	▪ 22.	225 ft	1.2% - 7.8%	CIPP Line
Reach 3	▪ 23.	354 ft	0.6% - 7.0%	CIPP Line
	▪ 24.	446 ft	1.4% - 10.6%	CIPP Line
	▪ 25.	654 ft	1.1% - 8.5%	CIPP Line
	▪ 26.	400 ft	0.4% - 10.2%	CIPP Line
	▪ 27.	350 ft	0.4% - 10.2%	CIPP Line
	▪ 28.	660 ft	0.5% - 8.5%	CIPP Line
	▪ 29.			
	▪ 30.			
	▪ 31.			


Disadvantaged Community Involvement (DCI) Program

Homelessness & Water Symposium Recap



OWOW Program Approach

1. Strengths and Needs Assessment
2. Education and Engagement
3. Project Development



- Disadvantaged / Tribal Community Pillar
- Technical Advisory Committee




Homelessness & Water Symposium

- In partnership with the Inland Empire Waterkeeper
- About 65 participants at 6-hour event
- June 29, 2017



Two panels, discussion, a keynote

- **The State of Homelessness in the Santa Ana River Watershed**
 - Eve Garrow, ACLU of SoCal
 - Damien O'Farrel, Path of Life Ministries
 - Emilio Ramirez, City of Riverside
 - Dep. Mike Jones, SB County SD



Two panels, discussion, a keynote

- **Considering a Human Right to Water**

- Anne Rios, Think Dignity
- Adam Fischer, Regional Board
- Rev. Amanda Ford, EJCW
- Angel Mayfield, Homeless advocate

- **Chris Brokate, Clean River Alliance**

AB 685, 2012
"every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes."



Outcomes / Next Steps

- A report of the meeting is being drafted, will be released via SAWPA website, social media
- Multiple attendees, including at least three different city reps encouraged follow-on meetings.
- Via DCI Program additional work can be programmed, at the recommendation the DCI Program TAC and the Steering Committee.



Recommendation

- It is recommended that the Commission receive and file this summary of the Homelessness and Water Symposium, a component of the Disadvantaged Communities Involvement Program.



DWR Prop 1 IRWM Implementation


Mark R. Norton PE, LEED AP
Santa Ana Watershed Project
Authority

Aug 15, 2017



Proposition 50, 84 and Prop 1 IRWM

- SAWPA is the State accepted IRWM group for future IRWM work in the watershed
- Successful project grants from Prop 50, Round 1, 2, Drought Round and 2015 Round under DWR's IRWM implementation program.
- SAWPA will be responsible for all audits and review of implemented Prop 50, Prop 84 and Prop 1 projects for 10 years after project completion.



Benefits:

- \$25 million – total from Prop 50
- \$114 million –total from Prop 84
- \$63 million – total from Prop 1

IRWM Funding Areas of Prop 1



Available Prop 1 IRWM Funding

Funding Areas	P1 Allocation	2% Bond Admin	5% Program Delivery	10% DAC Involvement	10% DAC Projects	Remaining*
North Coast	\$26,500,000	\$530,000	\$1,325,000	\$2,650,000	\$2,650,000	\$19,345,000
San Francisco Bay Area	\$65,000,000	\$1,300,000	\$3,250,000	\$6,500,000	\$6,500,000	\$47,450,000
Central Coast	\$43,000,000	\$860,000	\$2,150,000	\$4,300,000	\$4,300,000	\$31,390,000
Los Angeles	\$98,000,000	\$1,960,000	\$4,900,000	\$9,800,000	\$9,800,000	\$71,540,000
Santa Ana	\$63,000,000	\$1,260,000	\$3,150,000	\$6,300,000	\$6,300,000	\$45,990,000
San Diego	\$52,500,000	\$1,050,000	\$2,625,000	\$5,250,000	\$5,250,000	\$38,325,000
Sacramento River	\$37,000,000	\$740,000	\$1,850,000	\$3,700,000	\$3,700,000	\$27,010,000
San Joaquin River	\$31,000,000	\$620,000	\$1,550,000	\$3,100,000	\$3,100,000	\$22,630,000
Tulare/Kern	\$34,000,000	\$680,000	\$1,700,000	\$3,400,000	\$3,400,000	\$24,820,000
North/South						
Lahontan	\$24,500,000	\$490,000	\$1,225,000	\$2,450,000	\$2,450,000	\$17,885,000
Colorado River	\$22,500,000	\$450,000	\$1,125,000	\$2,250,000	\$2,250,000	\$16,425,000
Mountain Counties	\$13,000,000	\$260,000	\$650,000	\$1,300,000	\$1,300,000	\$9,490,000
Total	\$510,000,000	\$10,200,000	\$25,500,000	\$51,000,000	\$51,000,000	\$372,300,000

*Remaining Statewide Funding

Planning Solicitation	\$5,000,000
Implementation Solicitations	\$367,300,000
TOTAL	\$372,300,000

Prop 1 Grant Funding continues


■ Future OWOW grant applications

2018-19 1st Round Implementation
Projects - \$23 million and DAC projects -
\$6.3 million

2020-21 2nd Round Implementation
projects - \$23 million

SAWPA Next Steps:

- Continue OWOW goals and objectives
- Continue support for multi-benefit, collaborative watershed-scale projects
- Expand support to DACs and economically stressed areas
- Update OWOW Plan to new IRWM Plan Standards



Schedule - Future Prop 1 IRWM and related grants

Program	Apps Due	Final Awards	Execute Agreements	Program Close Out
Planning	Sep 2016	Jan. 2017	Jun. 2017	Jun. 2019
DAC Involvement	Open Filing	Jun. 2017	Sep. 2017	June 2020
2018 Implementation & DAC Projects	Spring 2018	Summer 2018	Fall 2018	Spring 2022
2020 Implementation	Spring 2020	Summer 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2024
Counties w/stressed basins	Dec. 2015	Mar. 2016		Summer 2018
SGWP & SDAC	Fall 2017	Early 2018		2020/2022

SGWP – Sustainable Groundwater Plan
SDAC - Severely Disadvantaged Communities

Prop 1 Implementation Eligible Projects

Included, but not limited to:

- Decision support tools
- Conjunctive use
- Improvement of water quality
- Storm water resource management
- Surface and underground water storage
- Water conveyance facilities
- Water desalination projects
- Water reuse and recycling
- Water-use efficiency and water conservation
- Watershed protection, restoration, and management projects



Prop 1 Requirements Eligible Applicants to SAWPA OWOW & Funding Match


- Public Agencies
- Non-profit Organizations
- Public Utilities
- Federally Recognized Indian Tribes
- California Native American Tribes
- Mutual Water Companies



- Non-State cost share not less than 50% of total project cost
- May be waived for certain projects benefiting Disadvantaged Communities and Economically Distressed Areas

Prop 1 Requirements (Cont.)

- Projects must be included in IRWM Plan (OWOW Plan) and:
 - Respond to climate change and
 - Contribute to regional water security (water supply reliability)
- Projects will address the most critical statewide needs and priorities for public funding
- Priority will be given to projects that leverage non-State funding or produce greatest public benefit
- Special consideration for projects that:
 - Achieve multiple benefits
 - Employ new or innovative technology or practices



DWR Principles for Change in Process

- Improve engagement between DWR and the IRWM regions to discuss how proposed projects will help the region and the Funding Area manage water more sustainably
- Give DWR an opportunity to seek clarification on projects in an application
- Give DWR the ability to only fund projects in a proposal that address the most critical needs within a Funding Area
- Maintain competition in the process
- Ensure projects developed through DACI Program have greatest chance to receive Implementation Grant Funding



DWR Proposed New Approach – Step 1A

- DWR will hold a public meeting in each of the 12 Funding Areas to:
 - Present the expectations of the grant application
 - Describe what it believes to be the Funding Area's greatest needs
 - Solicit input from the Funding Area to hear what it believes the greatest need of the Funding Area to be
- DWR will summarize the list of needs and publish for public comment
- Publish finalized list



DWR Proposed New Approach – Step 1B

- Each applicant, on behalf of its IRWM Region, submits a proposal with a suite of projects that require 150% of the maximum grant request
- Application will be brief and include project description to explain how proposed projects address needs of IRWM region and Funding Area, including benefits; schedule; and budget estimate
- DWR will perform a preliminary evaluation of the proposal using the criteria included in the PSP and a review of IRWM plans
- DWR will also formulate a list of questions about the proposal to submit to the applicant before Step 2



DWR Proposed New Approach – Step 2

- Applicant representatives will meet with DWR to:



- Justify the benefits claimed for each project and explain how they meet the Funding Area's greatest needs
 - Give DWR the opportunity to have its list of questions answered
- DWR will then finalize its evaluation of the projects and determine which projects of each application should be funded, if any

SAWPA Comments to DWR

- Concern with DWR bypassing and not acknowledging local IRWM governance and plan (*Top down approach*)
- Two step grant process creates additional grant preparation costs and delays
- Funding Area needs are defined in OWOW Plan
- DWR outreach and coordination with local IRWM is encouraged
- Support for innovative “integrated” pilot projects is encouraged



Proposed Solicitation Schedule

- At least Two Rounds
- Round 1 Draft Proposal Solicitation
Package to be released in late Fall 2017
- Applications due Spring 2018
- Round 2 – 2020



Questions?