The OWOW Steering Committee meeting was called to order at 11:04 a.m. by Ronald W. Sullivan, Convener, at the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority, 11615 Sterling Avenue, Riverside, California.

1. **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**
   Roll call was duly noted and recorded.
2. **PUBLIC COMMENTS**
   There were no public comments.

3. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES – March 22, 2018**
   MOVED, approve the March 22, 2018 meeting minutes.
   
   **Result:** Adopted (Passed)
   **Motion/Second:** Hessler/Roughton
   **Ayes:** Ackerman, Hessler, Roughton, Solorio, Sullivan
   **Nays:** None
   **Abstentions:** Whitaker
   **Absent:** Ashley, Hagman, Hall, Harrison, Nelson

4. **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**
   A. **OWOW Program Status (SC#2018.10)**
      Mike Antos provided a PowerPoint presentation with an OWOW Program status update. Committee Member Ackerman voiced support of the Trust the Tap Campaign and requested clarification of the targeted audience; Antos responded staff and the consultant are working in support of water retailers and their own communications (bill inserts, social media, website) within their communities, as well as utilizing trusted ethic media outlets.
      Convener Sullivan noted the City of Riverside had reached out for technical assistance by way of an MOU, and he asked if other communities have communicated an interest in receiving technical assistance. Antos noted the unique nature of Riverside’s MOU and stated there are various avenues by which technical assistance can be provided; at this point staff has identified the need for income surveys in disadvantaged communities with newly developed areas within those communities, among other avenues.

5. **BUSINESS ITEMS**
   A. **Incorporating Sub-regional Plans into OWOW Plan Update 2018 (SC#2018.11)**
      Mike Wellborn, President, Friends of Harbors Beaches and Parks and Krista Sloniowski, Connective Issue, provided a PowerPoint presentation on the Newport Bay Watershed Idea Book (Idea Book).
      A discussion ensued regarding the Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District (EIFD) referenced in the presentation. Sloniowski noted the EIFD is a possible funding tool of interest to the Infrastructure Funding Alliance which could replace former redevelopment funding with an infrastructure focus rather than a focus on housing. Committee Member Whitaker noted his skepticism of tax increment financing because it diverts existing property tax revenues and creates a floor with which existing property tax revenues do not grow, consequently cannibalizing traditional sources of necessary revenue for general fund purposes. The idea of an EIFD could be workable in a limited way; however, Whitaker noted this is an open process whereby the monies could be utilized for private corporations or developers. Sloniowski noted formation of the EIFD would be a joint effort of all the implementing parties, and an outside financer would provide the load money to the EIFD. Whitaker stated the EIFD model seems to be somewhat more measured than redevelopment. Normally there would be public oversight by way of city councils and county boards of supervisors, whereby the parties are held to certain requirements and standards, but the EIFD tends to move away from those controls. Whitaker stated that while these are his concerns, he is generally supportive of the overall holistic
approach and project.
Committee Member Roughton suggested staff work with the Coastal Conservancy to incorporate the Santa Ana River Conservancy Plan; Mike Antos noted the projects of that Plan have been imported, but that he would reach out to determine if they would be interested in pursuing this same path.
Convener Sullivan clarified this is not an application for a stand-alone grant, but an integration with other Orange County parties – essentially a matching fund proposal for projects OC parties may wish to accomplish cooperatively. Kloniowski noted the Idea Book is broader in scope, envisioning 100% sustainability.

**MOVED,** incorporate the Newport Bay Watershed Idea Book as an appendix to the OWOW Plan update 2018; and direct SAWPA staff to work with Friends of Harbors, Beaches and Parks to ensure proposed projects contained in the Newport Bay Watershed Idea Book are imported and fully-submitted to the OWOW Program Project Database to ensure inclusion of the OWOW Plan Update 2018.

Result: Adopted (Passed)
Motion/Second: Solorio/Ackerman
Ayes: Ackerman, Hessler, Roughton, Solorio, Sullivan
Nays: Whitaker
Abstentions: None
Absent: Ashley, Hagman, Hall, Harrison, Nelson

B. **California Water Plan Update 2018 Indicators Pilot Status (SC#2018.12)**
Mike Antos introduced Betty Andrews of Environmental Science Associates and Peter Vorster of The Bay Institute; and provided a PowerPoint presentation on the Sustainability Assessment for the Santa Ana River Watershed outlining the six goals with corresponding indicators and metrics.
Convener Sullivan asked what is the baseline, the established criteria to be measured against. As an example, who provides the average content to be measured against when measuring salt or Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL)? Antos responded the idea is that we measure progress toward our established goals. The systems already in place with regulatory and management goals – existing processes to manage salts that have targets which are set regulatorily or set by a management agency. The goals suggest an improvement trajectory of one way or another; what is the best way to indicate whether that trajectory called for by the goals is in progress or not. Convener Sullivan noted the importance of consistency, stating he would rather know definitively what a goal would be measured against before adopting this – that it clearly state the baseline each of these goals will be measured against. Larry McKenzie advised the first round will establish the baseline, which will be established by November; trends will be measured thereafter based on that established baseline.
Committee Member Whitaker noted a significant part of the solution in Southern California involve technology, finding new sources and solving these challenges. Much of this sustainability assessment is driven by the notion that we are going to be locked in perpetual rationing and normal, voluntary means of compliance give way to more coercive, mandated approaches such as a per-capita limit which is slowly squeezed over time. Some of these top-down, social engineering approaches reduce fundamental freedoms we have all come to appreciate over time even to a point where an average resident may be induced to forgo a pool or similar property improvement due to these types of mandates. Whitaker noted it troubling that we would be complying with a restrictive mode that does not take into account possible
new sources such as wastewater recycling efforts, the purchase of surplus water from other areas, etc. He encouraged a more freedom-friendly approach which states that supply is more elastic, and if we work in that direction we can achieve almost all the requirements over time. Relative to the goal to “Ensure high quality water for all people and the environment”, Committee Member Jose Solorio noted access to clean drinking water is more significant and important than safety of water for contact recreation. Relative to the goal to “Education and build trust between people and organizations”, Solorio note this is more difficult to measure, but if it is measured he suggested customer satisfaction surveys or studies, or via measurable communications between the entity and the people.

Convener Sullivan strongly suggested any retrospective should begin with 2015, which would be a timeframe inclusive of work accomplished by local agencies. Paul Jones, EMWD general manager, noted locally derived water supplies that are not stored, such as urban runoff, should be included in the language.

Committee Member Solorio left the meeting at 12:56 a.m., after the presentation and discussion of Agenda Item No. 5.B. and did not return.

This item was for informational and discussion purposes; no action was taken on Agenda Item No. 5.B.

C. Proposition 1 IRWM Grant Program – Project Rating & Ranking Process (SC#2018.13)
Mike Antos provided a PowerPoint presentation on project Rating and Ranking criteria. Staff will continue to seek input from the pillar chairs, stakeholders and other qualified staff; the final process will be brought before the Committee for consideration during the July meeting.

This item was for informational and discussion purposes; no action was taken on Agenda Item No. 5.C.

6. ADJOURNMENT
The meeting came to a close at 1:12 p.m.

APPROVED: July 26, 2018

Jasmin A. Hall, Convener

Attest:

Kelly Berry, GCM, Clerk of the Board