Recent History of Santa Ana River Trail & Parkway Progress

- 2003
  - Blue Ribbon Committee
  - Prop. 84: $45 M

- 2005
  - Santa Ana River Conservancy

- 2009
  - Prop. 68
  - $16 Million

- 2011
  - Voter Approval

- 2014

- 2017

- 2018
Story of a Successful Strategy

- **Powerful regional partnership.** Political support cooperation across counties and cities (our electeds work well together).
- **Unified.** Power and influence at state and federal level.
- **Funding.** Stable, diversified funding sources.
- **Public-Private partnership.** Locally led, locally controlled.
- **State agency.** Ability to channel funding and coordinate work.
- **Non-profit organization.** Raise funds and support, organize activities.
The Santa Ana River Trail and Parkway Partnership

Established by a Memorandum of Understanding
Policy Advisory Group (Elected Officials)
Technical Advisory Group (Managers)
Non-Profit Partners

Inland Empire Waterkeeper

Rivers & Lands Conservancy

Santa Ana River Trust
Corporate Partners

Bank of America

Patagonia
Santa Ana River Conservancy
Santa Ana River Conservancy
Program Priorities

• Santa Ana River Trail and Parkway
• Trail connections, trail heads and amenities
• Open space
• Wildlife habitat and species restoration, enhancement, and protection
• Wetland restoration and protection
• Agricultural land restoration and protection
• Protection and maintenance of water quality
• Related educational uses
• Natural floodwater conveyance
• Public access to program lands for recreation and education purposes in a manner consistent with the protection of land and the natural and economic resources in the area.
HOW TO ACCOMPLISH ALL THAT?

• Establish SARCON Policy Advisory Group: PAG 2015

• Develop the Santa Ana River Parkway & Open Space Plan

• Establish Technical Advisory Group: TAC 2016

• Public Outreach

• Plan Adoption and Implementation 2018 - 2019
PARKWAY & OPEN SPACE PLAN

Expanding the River's Reach
Purpose of the Plan

1. Define a shared vision for the Santa Ana River Parkway as a state, regional, and local asset

2. Generate the first comprehensive list of completed, planned and potential parkway projects

3. Provide tools for prioritizing, developing, and implementing projects through proactive collaboration
Planning Process

- Assemble plan development team: consultants, Policy Advisory Group, Technical Advisory Committee & staff
- Kick-off watershed tour
- Convene TAC to develop vision and goals
- Analyze current conditions: water, habitat, education
- Collect potential projects: planned and imagined from agencies, NGOs and existing plans
- Prioritized projects based on geospatial location suitability, proximity to river, project status
- Develop planning and design guidelines
Coordination and Collaboration
What is your vision for the Santa Ana River Parkway?

To Share Your Priorities and Ideas:

Complete a short online activity at:
http://www.placeworkscivic.com/project/santaanariver

Attend the Santa Ana River Trail Bike Ride & Festival!
at Ryan Bonaminio Park on June 11, 2017 at 9 am
5000 Tequesquite Ave, Riverside, CA

Attend a public workshop!
in San Bernardino or Orange County
Workshops are anticipated for Summer 2017

Website
http://scc.ca.gov/projects/santa-ana-river-conservancy/
Santa Ana River Trail Bike Ride & Festival
ACCESS & INTRODUCTION

Log-in and Homepage

http://www.mapcollaborator.org/sart/

Login – your email address
Password – SARP&OSP16
Understanding the Parkway

Chapter 1: Introduction
Chapter 2: Vision, Guiding Principles, and Goals
Chapter 3: Parkway Context and Existing Conditions

Parkway Projects

Chapter 4: Completing the SART
Chapter 5: Prioritization of Parkway Projects
Chapter 6: Planned and Potential Projects Beyond the SART

Guidelines and Implementation

Chapter 7: Planning Guidelines
Chapter 8: Design Principles and Guidelines
Chapter 9: Implementation
Guiding Principles

Water

Water is an essential and limited resource that should be carefully managed to maximize its benefit to people, plants, and animals while providing protection from flood flows.

Habitat and Wildlife

Wetland, riparian, and adjacent upland habitats along the river corridor provide multiple environmental and community benefits; these ecosystem functions should be respected, cared for, and conserved.

Education, Recreation, & Access

The river corridor is a resource that should provide equitable recreational, educational, and health benefits to all residents and visitors along its length and inspire sustained stewardship of the resource.

Implementation

Cooperation and collaboration among agencies, organizations, and members of the public is critical to developing the river corridor in a way that maximizes benefits to the natural and human environments and integrates effectively with other planning efforts.
PROJECTS!

155 potential projects identified

$500,000 plus

Opportunities for collaboration and cost sharing
First Priority: Completing the Santa Ana River Trail
Initial Steps - Concurrent

1. Santa Ana River Program Development
   1. Recognize SARP&OSP in Policy Documents
   2. Establish Voluntary Parkway Designation Program
   3. Build Recognition for the Santa Ana River Parkway

2. Project Development and Implementation
   1. Complete the SART
   2. Pursue High Priority Projects
   3. Continue to Update and Expand the Parkway Projects Prioritization Matrix
THE SANTA ANA RIVER CONSERVANCY

and

THE SANTA ANA RIVER PARKWAY PARTNERSHIP

RECOMMEND AND REQUEST INCLUSION OF THE SANTA ANA RIVER PARKWAY AND OPEN SPACE PLAN IN THE OWOW ONE WATER ONE WATERSHED PLAN

THANK YOU
QUESTIONS?
Overview

- What is a SWRP?
- What are the goals?
- What is in the SBC SARW SWRP?
- What is next?
What is a SWRP?

Evaluates existing water resources
Identifies projects, programs, and activities
Enhances the beneficial uses of stormwater and dry-weather runoff

- Watershed based
- Public/Stakeholder Driven
- Adaptively Managed

Adaptive Management

New Data
(water quality, studies, objectives, etc.)

Public and Stakeholder Input

SWRP Development
Apply Assessment Tools
Evaluate Multiple Benefits
Determine Implementation Approach
What is Required?

- Consistency with existing plans and permits
- Description of watershed
- Coordination with agencies and organizations
- Identification of projects
- Metrics-based analysis of project benefits
- Prioritization of multi-benefit projects
- Implementation strategy
- Education, outreach, and public participation
(b) A stormwater resource plan shall:

... (7) Upon development, be submitted to any applicable integrated regional water management group. Upon receipt, the integrated regional water management group shall incorporate the stormwater resource plan into its integrated regional water management plan.
What Types of Projects?

- Groundwater Recharge
- Habitat Restoration
- Channel Improvements
- Water Quality Enhancements
- Passive Recreation
- Recycled Water
What are the Goals?

- Protect the Environment
- Enhance Water Quality
- Maximize Water Supply
- Provide Community Benefits
- Improve Flood Management
- Protect the Environment

19 objectives associated with these goals
## Compatibility with OWOW Goals

### OWOW Plan Update 2018 Goals

| Achieve resilient water resources through innovation and optimization | Stormwater Recharge
| Recycled Water Recharge |
| Ensure high quality water for all people and the environment | Pollutant Load Reduction
| Stormwater Runoff Reduction |
| Preserve and enhance recreational areas, open space, habitat, and natural hydrologic function | Wetlands Enhancement/Creation
| Riparian Area Enhancement
| Streambed Restoration
| Increased Urban Green Space
| Recreational Path Creation
| Public Use Area Creation |
| Engage with members of disadvantaged communities and associated supporting organizations to diminish environmental injustices and their impacts on the watershed | Provide Employment Opportunities
| Increase Public Education
| Increase Community Involvement |
| Educate and build trust between people and organizations | Increase Public Education
| Increase Community Involvement |
What is in the SBC SARW SWRP?

1. Introduction
2. Watershed Identification
3. Water Quality Priorities
4. Organizations, Coordination, and Collaboration
5. Quantitative Methods
6. Project Identification and Prioritization
7. Implementation Strategy and Schedule
8. Education, Outreach, and Public Participation
2. Watershed Identification
4. Organizations, Coordination, Collaboration

- SAWPA OWOW
- Other regional plans
- TAC
- Public engagement
- Stakeholder engagement
5. Quantitative Methods

- Identify Projects
- Local Agencies
- Water Quality
- Water Supply
- Flood Control
- Environmental
- Community
- Stakeholders
- TAC
- Public
- Quantify Benefits
6. Project Identification & Prioritization
6. Project Identification & Prioritization
7. Implementation Strategy & Schedule

Implementation Approach
¡Esta invitado!

El Distrito de Control de Inundaciones del Condado de San Bernadino está liderando el desarrollo de un Plan de Recursos de Aguas Pluviales (SWRP) para la porción del Condado de San Bernadino localizado en la Cuenca del Río Santa Ana. Necesitamos su ayuda para planear el futuro de nuestros valiosos recursos hídricos.

¡Sea parte de este proceso fascinante!

¡Acompáñe el Distrito en nuestro evento para el público!

Aprende sobre:
- Nuestros recursos hídricos
- El Plan de Recursos de Aguas Pluviales (SWRP)
- Proyectos de beneficios múltiples
- Como puede participar

Ofrece su opinión sobre el borrador del SWRP

Vengan a compartir sus ideas.

Junta de información para el público

24 de julio de 2018, 5:00 - 7:00 pm
Department of Public Works Hearing Room
825 E. Third Street, San Bernardino

Revise el borrador del SWRP que se encuentra en http://bit.do/SWRP y proporcione su comentario por el 7 de agosto de 2018.

¡Esperamos verlos en la junta!

Para más información y para ofrecer su comentario, envíe un correo electrónico a swrp@cwecorp.com
How Did We Get Here?

- SWRP Outline
- Watershed Characterization
- Public Outreach
- Quantifying Benefits
- Project Prioritization
- Draft SWRP
- Public Draft SWRP
- Final SWRP

TAC Meeting
Public Outreach
Presentation to SAWPA
What is Next?

Official Approval: February 2019

Implementation Grants: Summer 2019

Implementation Grants: Fall 2019
Contact Information

SWRP@cwecorp.com

Arlene Chun
Arlene.chun@dpw.sbccounty.gov
(909) 387-8109

Katie Harrel
kharrel@cwecorp.com
(714) 526-7500 Ext. 205
Sustainability Assessment for the Santa Ana River Watershed

OWOW Plan Update 2018

Betty Andrews, PE, Environmental Science Associates (ESA)

Steering Committee Meeting
January 24, 2019
Presentation

1. Background
2. Framework
3. Assessment Process
4. Assessment Results

DWR (California Dept. of Water Resources)
SAWPA Staff & Consultants
OWOW Plan stakeholders
OWOW Plan Update 2018
Why a sustainability assessment?

Monitoring to accomplish the following:

• Inform the prioritization of, and investment in, actions
• Demonstrate progress
• Enlist support
• Educate
Sustainability Assessment Framework

Framework

Indicators

Assessment

Valuation

Metrics

Results

Communication
Sustainability Assessment Framework

OWOW Goals
- Indicators, Metrics

Scoring Approach
- Trend or Good/Bad
- Methodology

Rating Approach
- Positive, neutral, negative
- Thresholds

Results Reporting
- Sustainability Assessment Report

Communication

Valuation

Assessment, Results
### Indicators for the Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achieve resilient water resources through innovation and optimization.</th>
<th>Ensure high quality water for all people and the environment.</th>
<th>Preserve and enhance recreational areas, open space, habitat, and natural hydrologic function.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Maximization of locally-managed supplies</td>
<td>• Maintenance of groundwater salinity at or below target levels</td>
<td>• Abundance of vegetated riparian corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Efficiency of outdoor water use</td>
<td>• Safety of water for contact recreation</td>
<td>• Abundance of conserved open space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engage with members of disadvantaged communities and associated supporting organizations to diminish environmental injustices and their impacts on the watershed.</th>
<th>Educate and build trust between people and organizations.</th>
<th>Improve data integration, tracking and reporting to strengthen decision-making.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Equitable access to clean drinking water</td>
<td>• Collaboration for more effective outcomes</td>
<td>• Broaden access to data for decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proportionate implementation of climate change adaptation strategies</td>
<td>• Adoption of a watershed ethic</td>
<td>• Participation in an open data process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment Process

1. Confirm metric
2. Obtain data
3. Perform analysis
4. Confirm scoring approach
5. Generate results
6. Confirm rating thresholds
7. Assign rating
Assessment Process – After Analysis

- Trend Scoring or Good-Bad Scoring
- Quantitative or Qualitative
Assessment Process – After Analysis

- Trend Scoring or Good-Bad Scoring
- Quantitative or Qualitative
- What should qualify as a negative, neutral, or positive outcome?
Rating System

• Score leads to a rating
  • Positive
  • Neutral
  • Negative

• Quantitative v. Qualitative
Rating System

- Score leads to a rating
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Quantitative v. Qualitative
Summary Sheets: One for each Indicator

• OWOW Goal, Indicator, and Metric

• Of the 29 (out of 37 total) managed groundwater basins for which sufficient data exists for evaluation, 55% have salinity levels at the level of the salinity standard or better; when the results are weighted by volume in storage in each zone, the result rises to 77%.
• Overall, 82% of the rated groundwater volume either meets the water quality standard or fails to meet the standard but has significantly improved compared to recent historic values.
• Salinity within the groundwater basins of the watershed has increased somewhat since 2012, just prior to the conditions described in the last OWOW Plan.

Why Evaluate this Indicator?
Management of water quality in the groundwater basins of the watershed is essential to preserving their utility. Groundwater basins are the watershed’s most important local water storage tool, and salinity levels are a primary consideration for maintaining a high-quality, reliable water supply.
Summary Sheets: One for each Indicator

- OWOW Goal, Indicator, and Metric
- Assessment Results and Rating

- Of the 29 (out of 37 total) managed groundwater zones for which sufficient data exists for evaluation, 53% have salinity levels at the level of the salinity standard or better; when the results are weighted by volume in storage in each zone, the result rises to 71%.
- Overall, 81% of the rated groundwater volumes either meets the water quality standard, or falls to meet the standard but has significantly improved compared to recent historic values.
- Salinity within the groundwater basins of the watershed has increased somewhat since 2012, just prior to the conditions described in the last OWOW Plan.

Why Evaluate this Indicator?
Management of water quality in the groundwater basins of the watershed is essential to preserving their utility. Groundwater basins are the watershed’s most important local water storage tool, and salinity levels are a primary consideration for maintaining a high-quality, reliable water supply.
Summary Sheets: One for each Indicator

• OWOW Goal, Indicator, and Metric
• Assessment Results and Rating
• Indicator selection rationale

• Of the 39 (out of 37 total) managed groundwater zones for which sufficient data exists for evaluation, 53% have salinity levels at the level of the salinity standard or below; when the results are weighted by volume in storage in each zone, the result rises to 71%.
• Overall, 81% of the rated groundwater volume either meets the water quality standard, or fails to meet the standard but has significantly improved compared to recent historic values.
• Salinity within the groundwater bodies of the watershed has increased somewhat since 2012, just prior to the conditions described in the last OWOW Plan.

**Why Evaluate this Indicator?**

Management of water quality in the groundwater basins of the watershed is essential to preserving their utility. Groundwater basins are the watershed's most important local water storage tool, and salinity levels are a primary consideration for maintaining a high-quality, reliable water supply.
Summary Sheets: One for each Indicator

- OWOW Goal, Indicator, and Metric
- Assessment Results and Rating
- Indicator selection rationale
- Assessment Results Summary Graphic
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achieve resilient water resources through innovation and optimization</td>
<td>Maximization of locally-managed supplies</td>
<td>Percent of total annual supply sourced or managed locally</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Trend scoring approach. Potentially fully scoreable data set if data can be rectified. Qualitative trend assessment - inadequate data available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efficiency of outdoor water use</td>
<td>Percent of watershed population in agencies using parcel-level data to assess outdoor water use</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Trend scoring approach. One partial data unit incomplete assessment of all watershed retailers and how parcel-level data is actually used. Qualitative trend assessment - only one data point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure high quality water for all people and the environment</td>
<td>Maintenance of groundwater salinity at or below target levels</td>
<td>Non-exceedance of groundwater salinity standards</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Good-bad scoring approach. Fully scoring using quantitative data. Compare most recent (2015) to average triennial quantitative data 2003-2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety of water for contact recreation</td>
<td>Percentage of monitored sites where recreational use is likely and identified as low risk due to bacterial contamination</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Good-bad scoring approach. Fully scoring using quantitative data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve and enhance recreational areas, open space, habitat, and natural hydrologic function</td>
<td>Abundance of vegetated riparian corridor</td>
<td>Area of vegetated riparian corridor</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Trend scoring approach. Fully scoring based on quantitative data. Compare to average of prior 3 years of data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abundance of conserved open space</td>
<td>Area of conserved open space</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Trend scoring approach. Fully scoring based on quantitative data. Compare 2017 to 2016 data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage with members of disadvantaged communities and associated supporting organizations to diminish environmental injustices and their impacts on the watershed</td>
<td>Equitable access to clean drinking water</td>
<td>Relative value of the drinking water contaminant index from CalEnviroScreen between less resourced parts of the community and more resourced parts of the community</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Trend scoring approach. Qualitative trend assessment - only one data point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proportionate implementation of climate change adaptation strategies</td>
<td>Relative value of tree and shrub density between less resourced parts of the community and more resourced parts of the community</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Trend scoring approach. Qualitative trend assessment - only one data point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate and build trust between people and organizations</td>
<td>Collaboration for more effective outcomes</td>
<td>Percent of entities regulated by a total maximum daily load (TMDL) that have made financial or in-kind contributions to TMDL implementation</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Good-bad scoring approach. Fully scoring based on quantitative data. Compare 2017 to 2016 data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adoption of a watershed ethic</td>
<td>Total gallons of potable water used per capita per day</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Trend scoring approach. Fully scoring based on quantitative data. Compare to average of prior 10 years of data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve data integration, tracking and reporting to strengthen decision-making</td>
<td>Broader access to data for decision-making</td>
<td>Percent of watershed population in agencies whose residential customers receive relative performance information about their water use</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Trend scoring approach. Qualitative trend assessment - only one data point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation in an open data process</td>
<td>Percent of watershed population in agencies participating in establishment of a regional data sharing system</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Trend scoring approach. Qualitative trend assessment - inadequate data available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator and Metric</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicator</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieve resilient water resources through innovation and optimization</td>
<td>Maximizeation of locally-managed supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency of outdoor water use</td>
<td>Percent of watershed population in agencies using parcel-level data to assess outdoor water use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure high quality water for all people and the environment</td>
<td>Maintenance of groundwater salinity at or below target levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety of water for contact recreation</td>
<td>Percentage of monitored sites where recreational use is likely and identified as low risk due to bacterial contamination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve and enhance recreational areas, open space, habitat, and natural hydrologic function</td>
<td>Abundance of vegetated riparian corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abundance of conserved open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage with members of disadvantaged communities and associated supporting organizations to diminish environmental injustices and their impacts on the watershed</td>
<td>Equitable access to clean drinking water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proportionate implementation of climate change adaptation strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate and build trust between people and organizations</td>
<td>Collaboration for more effective outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adoption of a watershed ethic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve data integration, tracking and reporting to strengthen decision-making</td>
<td>Broader access to data for decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation in an open data process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: A face with a smile indicates that the rating results from a qualitative assessment.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achieve resilient water resources through innovation and optimization</td>
<td>Maximization of locally-managed supplies*</td>
<td>Percent of total annual supply sourced or managed locally</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Trend scoring approach. Potentially fully scoreable data set if data can be rectified. Qualitative trend assessment - inadequate data available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency of outdoor water use</td>
<td>Percent of watershed population in agencies using parcel-level data to assess outdoor water use</td>
<td></td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Trend scoring approach. One partial data set incomplete assessment of all watershed retailers and how parcel-level data is actually used. Qualitative trend assessment - only one data point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure high quality water for all people and the environment</td>
<td>Maintenance of groundwater salinity at or below target levels</td>
<td>Non-exceedance of groundwater salinity standards</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Good-bad scoring approach. Fully scoring using quantitative data. Compare most recent (2015) to average triennial qualitative data 2003-2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety of water for contact recreation</td>
<td>Percentage of monitored sites where recreational use is likely and identified as low risk due to bacterial contamination</td>
<td></td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Good-bad scoring approach. Fully scoring using quantitative data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve and enhance recreational areas, open space, habitat, and natural hydrologic function</td>
<td>Abundance of vegetated riparian corridor</td>
<td>Area of vegetated riparian corridor</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Trend scoring approach. Fully scoring based on quantitative data. Compare to average of prior 3 years of data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abundance of conserved open space</td>
<td>Area of conserved open space</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Trend scoring approach. Fully scoring based on quantitative data. Compare 2017 to 2016 data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage with members of dis advantaged communities and associated supporting organizations to diminish environmental injustices and their impacts on the watershed</td>
<td>Equitable access to clean drinking water</td>
<td>Relative values of the drinking water contaminant index found in CalEnviroScreen between less resource parts of the community and more resource parts of the community</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Trend scoring approach. Qualitative trend assessment - only one data point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proportionate implementation of climate change adaptation strategies</td>
<td>Relative values of tree and shrub density between less resource parts of the community and more resource parts of the community</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Trend scoring approach. Qualitative trend assessment - only one data point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate and build trust between people and organizations</td>
<td>Collaboration for more effective outcomes</td>
<td>Percent of entities regulated by a total maximum daily load (TMDL) that have made financial or in-kind contributions to TMDL implementation</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Good-bad scoring approach. Fully scoring based on quantitative data. Compare 2017 to 2016 data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adoption of a watershed ethic</td>
<td>Total gallons of potable water used per capita per day</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Trend scoring approach. Fully scoring based on quantitative data. Compare to average of prior 10 years of data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve data integration, tracking, and reporting to strengthen decision-making</td>
<td>Broader access to data for decision-making</td>
<td>Percent of watershed population in agencies whose residential customers receive reliable performance information about their water use</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Trend scoring approach. Qualitative trend assessment - only one data point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation in an open data process</td>
<td>Percent of watershed population in agencies participating in establishments of a regional data sharing system</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Trend scoring approach. Qualitative trend assessment - inadequate data available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A star with a dot indicates that the rating results from a qualitative assessment.
### Scoring Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achieve resilient water resources through innovation and optimization</td>
<td>Maximization of locally-managed supplies</td>
<td>Percent of total annual supply sourced or managed locally</td>
<td>🧐</td>
<td>Trend scoring approach. Potentially fully scoreable data set if data can be rectified. Qualitative trend assessment - inadequate data available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efficiency of outdoor water use</td>
<td>Percent of watershed population in agencies using parcel-level data to assess outdoor water use</td>
<td>🙂</td>
<td>Trend scoring approach. One partial data set incomplete assessment of all watershed retailers and how parcel-level data is actually used. Qualitative trend assessment - only one data point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure high quality water for all people and the environment</td>
<td>Maintenance of groundwater salinity at or below target levels</td>
<td>Non-exceedance of groundwater salinity standards</td>
<td>🙂</td>
<td>Good/bad scoring approach. Fully scoring using quantitative data. Compare most recent (2015) to average tritennial quantitative data 2003-2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety of water for contact recreation</td>
<td>Percentage of monitored sites where recreational use is likely and identified as low risk due to bacterial contamination</td>
<td>🙂</td>
<td>Good/bad scoring approach. Fully scoring using quantitative data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve and enhance recreational area, open space, habitat, and natural hydrologic function</td>
<td>Abundance of vegetated riparian corridor</td>
<td>Area of vegetated riparian corridor</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Trend scoring approach. Fully scoring based on quantitative data. Compare to average of prior 5 years of data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abundance of conserved open space</td>
<td>Area of conserved open space</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Trend scoring approach. Fully scoring based on quantitative data. Compare 2017 to 2016 data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage with members of disadvantaged communities and associated supporting organizations to diminish environmental injustices and their impacts on the watershed</td>
<td>Equitable access to clean drinking water</td>
<td>Relative value of the drinking water contaminant index from CaEnviroScreen between less resource parts of the community and more resource parts of the community</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Trend scoring approach. Qualitative trend assessment - only one data point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proportionate implementation of climate change adaptation strategies</td>
<td>Relative value of tree and shrub density between less resource parts of the community and more resource parts of the community</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Trend scoring approach. Qualitative trend assessment - only one data point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate and build trust between people and organizations</td>
<td>Collaboration for more effective outcomes</td>
<td>Percent of entities regulated by a total maximum daily load (TMDL) that have made financial or in-kind contributions to TMDL implementation</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Good/bad scoring approach. Fully scoring based on quantitative data. Compare 2017 to 2016 data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adoption of a watershed ethic</td>
<td>Total gallons of potable water used per capita per day</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Trend scoring approach. Fully scoring based on quantitative data. Compare to average of prior 10 years of data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve data integration, tracking and reporting to strengthen decision-making</td>
<td>Broader access to data for decision-making</td>
<td>Percent of watershed population in agencies whose residential customers receive relative performance information about their water use</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Trend scoring approach. Qualitative trend assessment - only one data point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation in an open data process</td>
<td>Percent of watershed population in agencies participating in establishment of a regional data sharing system</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Trend scoring approach. Qualitative trend assessment - inadequate data available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A face with 🧐 indicates that the rating results from a qualitative assessment.
Using the Assessment

1. Initiate assessment
2. Complete assessment
3. Use results to inform investments
4. Review assessment for refinement needs
5. Refine needs
6. Initiate assessment

1/24/2019 OWOW Sustainability Assessment
Feedback? Questions?
One Water
One Watershed Plan Update 2018
Moving forward together
Santa Ana River Watershed
OWOW Plan Update 2018

- **28** month effort
- Involving
  - **Over 100** authors
  - **Over 100** collaborative meetings
- Resulting in:
  - **Six** goals for achieving a sustainable watershed
- Over **100** recommended management and policy strategies
- ~**400** pages (including appendices)
- Including partnerships with
  - Many agencies, non-profits, students, community members
  - Department of Water Resources
  - U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
Now that we have it, how does it help us? What does it mean that we made it together?

How do we use the OWOW Plan Update 2018?
Stakeholders gathered to build upon the work of OWOW Plan, and OWOW 2.0 Plan

- **Chapters 1 & 2**
  - Collaborative planning, by and for the stakeholders, overseen by representative decision-makers.
  - Both of which built from earlier shared planning in the watershed.
Unique Collaboration & Decision-Making

STEERING COMMITTEE

City Mayor in San Bernardino County
Regional Water Board Representative
Environmental Community Member
Two SAWPA Representatives
San Bernardino County Supervisor

PILLARS

Water Resources Optimization
Water Quality
Disadvantaged Communities and Tribal Communities
Climate Risk and Response
Integrated Stormwater Management

City Mayor in Orange County
Business Community Member
Orange County Supervisor
Riverside County Supervisor
City Mayor in Riverside County

Land Use and Water Planning
Natural Resources Stewardship
Water Recycling
Water Use Efficiency
Data Management and Monitoring

Source: One Water One Watershed & Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority
What are the shared vision, goals and objectives across the entire watershed?

• Chapter 3

• Establishing a Vision, and Goals, set the stage for collaborative planning. It is a critical piece, building common purpose.
The Vision of OWOW

• A Santa Ana River Watershed that is:
  • Is sustainable, droughtproof, and salt balanced by 2040;
  • Avoids and removes interruptions to natural hydrology, protecting water resources for all;
  • Uses water efficiently, supporting economic and environmental vitality;
  • Is adapted to acute and chronic climate risk and reduces carbon emissions;
  • Works to diminish environmental injustices;
  • Encourages a watershed ethic at the institutional and personal level.
Achieve resilient water resources through innovation and optimization.

Ensure high-quality water for all people and the environment.

Preserve and enhance recreational areas, open space, habitat, and natural hydrologic function.

Engage with members of disadvantaged communities and associated supporting organizations to diminish environmental injustices and their impacts on the watershed.

Educate and build trust between people and organizations.

Improve data integration, tracking, and reporting to strengthen decision making.
Now, what are our strengths, opportunities, and challenges?

- Chapter 4

- The Watershed Setting describes the physical, social, and water management realities of the Watershed.
To achieve our vision, our goals, what should we do?

- Chapter 5

- Recommended Management and Policy Strategies, the heart and core of the plan, built by stakeholders.

- What the experts believe are the right transformations, and efforts.

- And, where do they agree and align across expertise?
How do we allocate available resources to our most critical needs?

• Chapter 6

• When grant funding is available, a collaborative process for selecting the right efforts to support.
What can be achieved if we are successful?

- Chapter 7

- The impacts and benefits of pursuing shared planning, and achieving sustainable integrated solutions.
How can we pay for and track the successes of our efforts?

- Chapters 8 & 9
  - Financing the efforts included will require more than the IRWM implementation grants.
  - Understanding the successes and challenges in our efforts support future decisions.
Logic of OWOW Plan Update 2018

Stakeholders gathered to build upon the work of OWOW Plan, and OWOW 2.0 Plan

What are the shared vision, goals and objectives across the entire watershed?

Now, what are our strengths, opportunities, and challenges?

To achieve our vision, our goals, what should we do?

How do we allocate available resources to our most critical needs?

What can be achieved if we are successful?

How can we pay for and track the successes of our efforts?
Implementation through Watershed Coordination

- IRWM implementation grants
- Other state and federal grants
- Collaborative projects
- Single-organization projects
- Educational efforts
- Ongoing collaboration
- Strong community engagement
- Not just SAWPA – not just the OWOW Program
Next Steps

• If recommended today:
  • Public Hearing and consideration of formal adoption
    • At SAWPA Commission, February 19, 2019
  • Submittal to Department of Water Resources for approval
Recommendations

1. It is recommended that the OWOW Steering Committee consider recommending the One Water One Watershed Plan Update 2018 be adopted by the SAWPA Commission.
Disadvantaged Communities Involvement Program

Technical Assistance for Community Need
DCI Program Elements

- Program Element 1: Strengths and Needs Assessment
- Program Element 2: Engagement / Education
- Program Element 3: Project Development
- Program Element 4: Grant Administration

Program Team:
- SAWPA, CivicSpark Water Fellows, California State University, Local Government Commission, California Rural Water Association, University of California Irvine, Water Education Foundation
## Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Element</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
<th>% expended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Strengths &amp; Needs</td>
<td>$898,644</td>
<td>$434,190</td>
<td>51.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Engagement / Education</td>
<td>$1,853,068</td>
<td>$1,631,612</td>
<td>11.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Project Development</td>
<td>$3,233,288</td>
<td>$3,124,381</td>
<td>3.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Administration</td>
<td>$315,000</td>
<td>$282,117</td>
<td>10.44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Tasks / Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Element Components</th>
<th>OWOW Plan Update 2018</th>
<th>OWOW Plan Update 2018</th>
<th>OWOW Plan Update 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PE1</strong></td>
<td>PE1</td>
<td>PE1</td>
<td>PE1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCI Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>PE1</td>
<td>PE1</td>
<td>PE1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged Communities &amp; Tribal Communities Pillar</td>
<td>PE1</td>
<td>PE1</td>
<td>PE1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage Local Elected Leaders</td>
<td>PE1</td>
<td>PE1</td>
<td>PE1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage Mutual Water Companies</td>
<td>PE1</td>
<td>PE1</td>
<td>PE1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage Water Agencies</td>
<td>PE1</td>
<td>PE1</td>
<td>PE1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Listening Workshops</td>
<td>PE1</td>
<td>PE1</td>
<td>PE1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Water Ethnography of the Santa Ana River Watershed (PE1 Final Report)</td>
<td>PE1</td>
<td>PE1</td>
<td>PE1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness &amp; Water Convening</td>
<td>PE1</td>
<td>PE1</td>
<td>PE1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PE2</strong></td>
<td>PE2</td>
<td>PE2</td>
<td>PE2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal Consultation</td>
<td>PE2</td>
<td>PE2</td>
<td>PE2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of Water / Trust the Tap campaign</td>
<td>PE2</td>
<td>PE2</td>
<td>PE2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation Services</td>
<td>PE2</td>
<td>PE2</td>
<td>PE2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement Best Practices Publications</td>
<td>PE2</td>
<td>PE2</td>
<td>PE2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of the Santa Ana Watershed Conferences</td>
<td>PE2</td>
<td>PE2</td>
<td>PE2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Water Education</td>
<td>PE2</td>
<td>PE2</td>
<td>PE2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Agency Community Engagement Training</td>
<td>PE2</td>
<td>PE2</td>
<td>PE2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Elected Leader Training</td>
<td>PE2</td>
<td>PE2</td>
<td>PE2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement Intern Program</td>
<td>PE2</td>
<td>PE2</td>
<td>PE2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PE3</strong></td>
<td>PE3</td>
<td>PE3</td>
<td>PE3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance for Community Needs</td>
<td>PE3</td>
<td>PE3</td>
<td>PE3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWOW Plan Update 2018</td>
<td>PE3</td>
<td>PE3</td>
<td>PE3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CivicSpark Water Fellows</td>
<td>PE3</td>
<td>PE3</td>
<td>PE3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PE4</strong></td>
<td>PE4</td>
<td>PE4</td>
<td>PE4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement Administration</td>
<td>PE4</td>
<td>PE4</td>
<td>PE4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invoicing</td>
<td>PE4</td>
<td>PE4</td>
<td>PE4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Report and Final Report</td>
<td>PE4</td>
<td>PE4</td>
<td>PE4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Technical Assistance for Community Need

Activity 18 Technical Assistance for Community Needs

• During engagement efforts the program team will learn of projects, plans and programs. Following evaluation of these projects, plans and programs, an appropriate set will receive Technical Assistance (TA) including but not limited to project engineering services, curriculum development, translation services, and program support. The evaluation of the projects, plans, and programs will follow a set of evaluation criteria developed by DCI Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)…
# Technical Advisory Committee Roster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holly Alpert</td>
<td>California Rural Water Association</td>
<td>Program Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boykin Witherspoon</td>
<td>CSU Water Resources Policy Initiative</td>
<td>Program Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Olson</td>
<td>University of California, Irvine</td>
<td>Program Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Pitzer</td>
<td>Water Education Foundation</td>
<td>Program Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Dolan</td>
<td>Local Government Commission</td>
<td>Program Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatrice Musacchia</td>
<td>Orange County Public Works</td>
<td>TAC member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Lovested</td>
<td>Eastern Municipal Water District</td>
<td>TAC member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart McKibbin</td>
<td>Riverside County Flood Control District</td>
<td>TAC member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan Brousseau</td>
<td>Inland Empire Waterkeeper</td>
<td>Disadvantaged Communities and Tribal Communities Pillar Chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Technical Assistance for Community Need

- Four early-action items approved by the TAC:
  - Income Surveys
    - (CRWA & CSU)
  - Big Bear Water Sustainability Project
    - (if approved by SAWPA Commission, sub-grant agreement)
  - Tribal Working Group
    - (if approved by SAWPA Commission, CWRA)
  - Monitoring WQ & Riparian habitat impact of homelessness
    - (if approved by SAWPA Commission, SAWPA consultant)
Technical Assistance for Community Need

• Next Steps:
  • Department of Water Resources must also sign-off that these activities are compliant with the Prop 1 Disadvantaged Community Involvement Grant program.

• There remains a large list of candidate programs, plans and projects:
  • TAC to further refine eligibility criterion
  • Select additional TA activities to pursue
Recommendations

1. It is recommended that the OWOW Steering Committee receive and file this presentation of the status of the Technical Assistance for Community Needs activity within the Disadvantaged Communities Involvement (DCI) Program.
Ongoing discussions with North & Central Orange County Regional Water Management Group

Rich Haller, General Manager
OWOW Steering Committee
January 24, 2019
Issues under discussion

- OC Public Works, on behalf of other agencies and stakeholders asks:
  1. To have the OC Plan (2018) “meaningfully included” in the OWOW Plan Update 2018
  2. 38% of the available funding in Prop 1 IRWM Implementation grants pre-allocated to projects in North Orange County
  3. The OC Plan rating & ranking system be used to select projects to use that allocation
Regional Acceptance Process

- OC Public Works has submitted a Regional Acceptance Process application to Department of Water Resources.
- DWR has suggested a decision **by the end of January**.
- If approved:
  - North Orange County RWMG would be eligible to apply for IRWM grants within the Santa Ana Funding Area, after submitting a compliant IRWM plan.
  - These applications would be competitive with the OWOW Program applications, with DWR selecting which proposal got how much money.
Response Proposal to OC Partners

- A 25% minimum allocation would be assured for projects located in each Orange County, Riverside County and San Bernardino County
- Remaining 25% of funding would be awarded to project proponents based on merit
- OC Plan rating & ranking used to create a suite of projects then could be submitted by OC Partners as a single program to the OWOW Program call-for-projects seeking grants
OC Counter Proposal

- 1/3 of available implementation grants be pre-allocated to Orange County, Riverside County, and San Bernardino County.
  - Each County could choose to assign funds from their allocation for larger scale cross county regional projects.
- If there is a formal allocation to County areas, the concern about harm from upstream projects on downstream areas is potentially mitigated.
- If 1/3 pre-allocation by County is agreed to, OC Public Works will withdraw its Regional Acceptance Process application with DWR.