REGULAR MEETING OF THE
OWOW STEERING COMMITTEE
Thursday, September 26, 2019 – 11:00 a.m.
at SAWPA, 11615 Sterling Avenue, Riverside, CA 92503

AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER | PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE (Kati Parker, Convener)

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS
   Members of the public may address the Committee on items within the jurisdiction of the Committee; however, no action may be taken on an item not appearing on the agenda unless the action is otherwise authorized by Government Code §54954.2(b).

3. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES: July 25, 2019 .................................................................3

4. BUSINESS ITEMS
   A. Disadvantaged Community Involvement (DCI) Program Status (SC#2019.12) ..........................7
      Presenters: Mark Norton | Rick Whetsel
      Recommendation: Receive and file.
   B. OWOW Proposition 1 Round 1 Integrated Regional Water Management Project Grant Application and Related Agreements (SC#2019.13) .................................................................19
      Presenter: Ian Achimore
      Recommendation: Receive and file.
   C. Advocacy Efforts Regarding IRWM (SC#2019.14) .................................................................27
      Presenter: Larry McKenney
      Recommendation: Receive and file an informational report and provide input to SAWPA staff.
D. **Proposition 84 Round 2 Implementation Grant Agreement Amendment (SC#2019.15)**

   **Presenter:** Marie Jauregui  
   **Recommendation:** Receive and file.

5. **ADJOURNMENT**

   PLEASE NOTE:
   Americans with Disabilities Act: Meeting rooms are wheelchair accessible. If you require any special disability related accommodations to participate in this meeting, please contact (951) 354-4220 or kberry@sawpa.org. Notification at least 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable staff to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility for this meeting. Requests should specify the nature of the disability and the type of accommodation requested.

   Materials related to an item on this agenda submitted to the Commission after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the SAWPA office, 11615 Sterling Avenue, Riverside, and available at www.sawpa.org, subject to staff's ability to post documents prior to the meeting.

   **Declaration of Posting**
   I, Kelly Berry, Clerk of the Board of the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority declare that on Thursday, September 19, 2019, a copy of this agenda has been uploaded to the SAWPA website at [www.sawpa.org](http://www.sawpa.org) and posted at the SAWPA office, 11615 Sterling Avenue, Riverside, California.

   /s/  
   Kelly Berry, CMC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019 – OWOW Steering Committee Meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Thursday of Every Other Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(January, March, May, July, September, November)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NOTE: All meetings begin at 11:00 a.m., unless otherwise noted, and are held at SAWPA.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 24, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 23, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 26, 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Meeting date adjusted due to conflicting holiday.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2020 – OWOW Steering Committee Meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Thursday of Every Other Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(January, March, May, July, September, November)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NOTE: All meetings begin at 11:00 a.m., unless otherwise noted, and are held at SAWPA.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 23, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 28, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 24, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Meeting date adjusted due to conflicting holiday.
The OWOW Steering Committee meeting was called to order at 11:14 a.m. by Kati Parker, Convener, at the Western Municipal Water District, 14205 Meridian Parkway, Riverside, CA 92518 and via telephone conference at 300 N. Flower Street, Room 788, Santa Ana, CA 92703 (Committee Member Bilodeau) and 20 Civic Center Plaza, Conference Room 815, Santa Ana, CA 92701 (Committee Member Solorio).
1. **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**
Introductions were duly noted and recorded. Supervisor Karen Spiegel, County of Riverside, was welcomed as a new member of the OWOW Steering Committee.

2. **PUBLIC COMMENTS**
Committee Member Robertson arrived at 11:19 a.m., during public comments.
Gil Navarro, Division II Director, San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District, noted concerning impacts to water quality within disadvantaged communities and spoke in support of funding within those communities.
There were no public comments from either telephone conference location.

3. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES – May 23, 2019**
MOVED, approve the May 23, 2019 meeting minutes.

Result: Adopted by Roll Call Vote (Passed)
Motion/Second: Bailey/Robertson
Ayes: Bailey, Bilodeau, Parker, Robertson, Solorio
Nays: None
Abstentions: Brown, Spiegel
Absent: Ackerman, Chaffee, Hagman, Hessler

4. **BUSINESS ITEMS**

A. **Disadvantaged Community Involvement (DCI) Program Technical Assistance Criteria (SC#2019.9)**
Matthew Howard provided a PowerPoint presentation titled, Disadvantaged Community Involvement (DCI) Program Technical Assistance Criteria, a slightly revised version from that contained in the agenda packet on pages 15-17. The DCI Program Technical Advisory Committee, in collaboration with SAWPA and DWR staff, have finalized the Technical Assistance Project Criteria included in the agenda packet on pages 10-14.

Committee Member Brown voiced frustration that large amounts of available grant funding ($500,000 previously; $2.9 million presently) continue to be allocated to entities conducting studies but grant funding is not actually being invested to help anyone in disadvantaged communities. Howard noted the projects set forth will be in disadvantaged communities, economically distressed communities, or underrepresented areas; there is an additional $6.3 million in grant funding available for implementation. The goal in Proposition 1 Round 2 is to allocate more funding for implementation within those communities; the outcome of conducting studies and providing technical assistance is to further community involvement and leverage implementation grant funding in those communities. There was a brief discussion regarding the wide variety of projects spanning all three counties, the state’s definition of disadvantaged communities (based on median household income) within the context of this grant funding, and how communities could submit existing projects. SAWPA staff is available to review/address project specific comments or questions.
Committee Member Bailey requested a copy of the referenced Community Water Ethnography Report. Howard noted a draft report was submitted to DWR in May; Rich Haller advised a copy
would be provided to the Committee members as well as the revised PowerPoint presentation for this Agenda Item No. 4.A.

Committee Member Solorio voiced ongoing concern that large sums have been expended for the benefit of water agencies and institutions, and he encouraged utilizing the information obtained as a result of the studies, etc., to determine which entities are actually working directly with disadvantaged communities and perhaps they could be pre-qualified. A great deal of funding has already been spent to identify needs, yet we still haven’t identified priorities or invested in communities.

Committee Member Bilodeau stated he had no questions regarding Agenda Item No. 4.A. This item was for informational purposes; no action was taken on Agenda Item No. 4.A.

B. **Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians Residential Asbestos Cement Pipe Abandonment and Replacement Project – Disadvantaged Communities Involvement (DCI) Program Technical Assistance Project (SC#2019.8)**

Matthew Howard provided a PowerPoint presentation titled, Disadvantaged Community Involvement (DCI) Program Technical Assistance Project, a slighted revised version from that contained in the agenda packet on pages 21-22. The DCI Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) has reviewed and approved this project for recommendation of technical assistance funding to the OWOW Steering Committee. The Project requests $350,000 to complete outlined work from the DCI Program Technical Assistance Funding, which most likely will be bid utilizing an RFP process. Committee Member Brown asked for the actual replacement cost; Howard responded the cost would be determined by the pre-engineering report.

MOVED, recommend the proposed Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians Residential Asbestos Cement Pipe Abandonment and Replacement Project to the SAWPA Commission for funding under the Disadvantaged Communities Involvement (DCI) Program.

Result: Adopted by Roll Call Vote (Unanimously)

Motion/Second: Bailey/Brown

Ayes: Bailey, Bilodeau, Brown, Parker, Robertson, Solorio, Spiegel

Nays: None

Abstentions: None

Absent: Ackerman, Chaffee, Hagman, Hessler

C. **Final Report from Departing CivicSpark Water Fellows (SC#2019.11)**

Marisa Perez-Reyes and Brian Keener, departing CivicSpark Fellows, provided a PowerPoint presentation titled, Supporting the Implementation of the DCI Program, contained in the agenda packet on pages 28-37. The DCI Program supports two CivicSpark Water Fellows each year, beginning in September and ending in August. Certificates of Appreciation were presented to Marisa Perez-Reyes and Brian Keener.

This item was for informational purposes; no action was taken on Agenda Item No. 4.C.
D. **North Orange County Stakeholder Group Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Portfolio and the Department of Water Resources (DWR) Review of the OWOW Plan Update 2018 (SC#2019.10)**

Ian Achimore, joined by Christy Suppes, Orange County Public Works, provided a PowerPoint presentation titled, North OC Stakeholder Group IRWM Portfolio and the DWR Review of the OWOW Plan Update 2018, contained in the agenda packet on pages 43-54.

Committee Member Solorio moved the item, which was seconded by Committee Member Bilodeau. Committee Member Solorio left the meeting at 12:23 p.m. and did not return.

Committee Member Bilodeau noted that as Director of Division 2, he is an officer with the Orange County Water District and he falls under the remote interest provision of Government Code Section 1091.

MOVED, recommend the North Orange County Stakeholder Group Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) projects to be added to the previous portfolio of projects submitted to SAWPA Commission for funding under the Department of Water Resources (DWR) Proposition 1 IRWM Round 1 grant program.

**Result:** 
Adopted by Roll Call Vote (Passed)

**Motion/Second:** Solorio/Bilodeau

**Ayes:** Bailey, Bilodeau, Parker, Robertson, Solorio, Spiegel

**Nays:** None

**Abstentions:** Brown

**Absent:** Ackerman, Chaffee, Hagman, Hessler

Rich Haller noted the importance of this item in solidifying the working relationship with the Orange County Stakeholders moving forward and thanked Amanda Carr for her vision and efforts during this process.

5. **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting came to a close at 12:41 a.m.

**APPROVED:** September 26, 2019

________________________________________
Kati Parker, Convener

Attest:

________________________________________
Kelly Berry, CMC, Clerk of the Board
DATE: September 26, 2019
TO: OWOW Steering Committee
SUBJECT: Disadvantaged Community Involvement (DCI) Program Status
PREPARED BY: Rick Whetsel, Senior Watershed Manager

RECOMMENDATION
It is recommended that the OWOW Steering Committee receive and file this information report about the current status of the Disadvantaged Communities Involvement (DCI) Program.

DISCUSSION
The Disadvantaged Communities Involvement Program (DCI Program) for the Santa Ana River Watershed has three main Program Elements, within which are twenty separate activities. Those three Program Elements consist of 1) Strengths and Needs Assessment, 2) Engagement and Education, 3) Project Development. A fourth element contains grant administration tasks assigned to SAWPA.

The attached presentation provides an update on the activities within each of these Project Elements.

BACKGROUND
The Disadvantaged Communities Involvement Program is a Prop 1 funded effort within the Integrated Regional Water Management Program to ensure the involvement of disadvantaged communities, economically distressed areas, and underrepresented communities in integrated regional water management planning. As the Santa Ana River Watershed approved Regional Water Management Group, SAWPA was awarded a $6.3 million grant in June 2017. With permission from DWR, SAWPA and our partners have been working on the scope since October 2016.

SAWPA manages the program with five program partners: California State University, Local Government Commission (a 501c3 nonprofit), the California Rural Water Association (a 501c3 nonprofit), the Water Education Foundation (a 501c3 nonprofit), and the University of California Irvine. Each partner organization has a defined scope of work, and together is responsible for project management and reporting.

Attachments:
1. PowerPoint Presentation
Disadvantaged Community Involvement Program:
Status Report

Rick Whetsel, Senior Watershed Manager

OWOW Steering Committee
September 26, 2019

Program Elements

1. Strengths and Needs Assessment
2. Education and Engagement
3. Project Development
4. Administration
Program Partners

- California State University, San Bernardino
- University of California, Irvine
- Local Government Commission
- California Rural Water Association
- Water Education Foundation
- OWOW Steering Committee
- SAWPA

Program Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Element</th>
<th>Budget Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strength &amp; Needs Assessment</td>
<td>$699,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement &amp; Education</td>
<td>$1,845,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Development</td>
<td>$3,441,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Administration</td>
<td>$315,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,300,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Strengths & Needs Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity #</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>DACI Technical Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>DAC / Tribal Pillar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Engage Local Elected Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Engage Mutual Water Companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Engage Water Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Community Listening Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Community Water Ethnography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Homelessness &amp; Water Convening</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activity 7: Community Water Ethnography

- **Objective:** Strengths and needs assessment designed by SAWPA and its partner agencies to take the next step in integrated and inclusive watershed planning.
- **Lead Author:** Valerie Olson, Ph.D.
  Department of Anthropology
  University of California, Irvine
- **Current Status:** Internal Draft Review by TAC
- **Final Report:** October 1, 2019
2. Education & Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity #</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tribal Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Trust the Tap Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Translation Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Engagement Best Practices Publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>State of the Watershed Conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Community Water Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Water Agency Engagement Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Local Elected Leader Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Community Engagement Interns Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activity 9: Tribal Consultation

- **Objective:** Establish a Tribal Advisory Committee (Tribal AC) with California Native American Indian Tribes and agency staff to provide opportunities for collaboration.
- **Activity Lead:** CRWA
- **Current Status:** development of Charter
**Activity 11: Translation Services**

- **Objective:** Translation services for documents and meetings are available.
- Foreign languages include, but are not limited to, Spanish, Vietnamese, Korean, Chinese, and Tagalog.
- American Sign Language interpretation available for simultaneous translation.
- **Activity Lead:** SAWPA / CivicSparks
- **Current Status:** Ongoing

**Activity 12: Engagement Best Practices Publication**

- **Objective:** Publication to look at the engagement of disadvantaged communities with water management, with case studies from around the state.
- **Activity lead:** WEF
- **Current Status:** Internal Draft Publication
Activity 14: Community Water Education

- Objective: host community water education events, distributed appropriately to serve local communities throughout the watershed using information garnered during the Strengths & Needs Assessment program element.
- Activity Lead: LGC supported by UCI and CRWA
- Current Status: LGC working on a proposal to SAWPA

Community Water Conversations

Big Bear Lake, CA

- Big Bear Community September 9th
- Quail Valley September 24th
- Orange County (City and Time TBD)
Activity 15: Water Agency Engagement Training

- Objective: to provide training to water agency staff in the watershed.
- Activity Lead: CRWA
- Current Status: CRWA working on a proposal to SAWPA

Activity 16: Local Elected Leader Training

- Objective: Provide trainings for local elected leaders and their staff in the watershed. These training sessions will relay the findings of the Strengths & Needs Assessment program element, basic information on water management topics, and best practices for helping the communities they serve interact with water planning.
- Activity Lead: LGC
- Current Status: LGC has completed the first of three rounds of workshops.
Santa Ana Watershed Ambassador Program for Local Policymakers

**Round 1: Getting to Know Your Watershed (September 2019)**
San Bernardino County: September 10, 2019, Pomona College, Claremont, CA
Riverside County: September 12, 2019, Eastern Municipal Water District
Orange County: September 16, 2019, Orange County Water District

**Round 2: Collaborative Planning in the Face of Uncertainty (January 2020)**

**Round 3: Communicating the Value of Water to Your Constituents (April 2020)**
Activity 17: Community Engagement Interns Program

- Objective: Provide internships for students from the CSU, UC and community college campuses of the watershed.
- Activity Lead: CSUSB / Civic Sparks
- Current Status: Ongoing

3. Project Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity #</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Technical Assistance / Project Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>OWOW Plan Update 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>CivicSpark Water Fellows</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activity 18: Technical Assistance / Project Implementation

- Objective: technical Assistance (TA) funding to support the development of projects and programs that address the needs of disadvantaged and underrepresented communities.
- Available funding: $2.9M
- DCI TAC recommends projects for approval by the OWOW Steering Committee and the SAWPA Commission
- Initial Application Review: September 27, 2019

List of Pre-Approved Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Assistance / Project Implementation</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tribal Advisory Committee</td>
<td>$125,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Homelessness Impacts</td>
<td>$74,441.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soboba Asbestos Pipes</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replenish Big Bear</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budget</td>
<td>$2,991,588.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remaining Funds to be Allocated $1,792,147.00
Demo of DCI Program Webpage on SAWPA Website

Questions
OWOW STEERING COMMITTEE MEMORANDUM NO. 2019.13

DATE: September 26, 2019

TO: OWOW Steering Committee

SUBJECT: OWOW Proposition 1 Round 1 Integrated Regional Water Management Project Grant Application and Related Agreements

PREPARED BY: Ian Achimore, Senior Watershed Manager

RECOMMENDATION

Receive and file.

DISCUSSION

On May 23, staff presented, and the OWOW Steering Committee recommended that the SAWPA Commission approve a suite of eight projects for consideration to receive approximately $16.7 million OWOW Proposition 1 Round 1 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) grant funding. Of that $16.7 million available, approximately $2.2 million was allocated for projects with a direct link to disadvantaged communities. On July 25, the Committee recommended the SAWPA Commission approve the three North Orange County Stakeholder’s IRWM projects, totaling $6.2 million in grant funding, per the recently adopted North Orange County Stakeholders/SAWPA Cooperative Agreement regarding IRWM grant funding. The total grant funding for the eight OWOW projects, three North Orange County projects, and grant administration by SAWPA totals $24.1 million. SAWPA submitted the pre-application materials for the eleven projects on July 26 to the Department of Water Resources (DWR), the State agency that manages the State-wide IRWM grant program.

On August 14, DWR provided SAWPA and the eleven project proponents feedback during a pre-application workshop. As a result of that meeting, several project proponents are making changes to their budgets in order to ensure grant funding is provided to eligible tasks such as construction. The non-eligible tasks, such as education/training and recreation improvements, are being organized as additional cost share items in the project budgets so no grant funding is paid for those tasks. Even in light of these comments, no projects were deemed ineligible as part of DWR’s review. SAWPA will submit the final DWR application by their deadline of November 1, 2019.

After approval by DWR through their final application review, as done in past IRWM funding rounds, SAWPA will prepare a grant agreement with DWR that includes the scope of work, budget and schedule for all eleven projects. SAWPA will also execute sub-agreements with each of the eleven project proponents that incorporate the provisions of the grant agreement that are specific to each project’s scope. It is estimated that the final application review will be completed by DWR and the award of grant funds will be announced in early 2020.
BACKGROUND

In preparation for the OWOW Proposition 1 Round 1 IRWM Grant program, SAWPA conducted a Call for Projects in January 2019. Based on the Call for Projects, 30 projects were received. Four of the 30 projects later integrated per the Let’s Connect process to bring the total to 28 projects. Ultimately, eight projects were approved by the Steering Committee and SAWPA Commission for submission to DWR through their pre-application process. In accordance with the MOU between SAWPA and the North OC IRWM stakeholders, staff incorporated three additional IRWM projects from the North OC call for projects managed by the County of Orange’s Department of Public Works.

Dudek, who has been hired by SAWPA as its grant writing support, organized all OWOW and North OC Stakeholder project information into the project information forms required for the pre-application workshop with DWR. The pre-application material included detailed project information pertaining to the portfolio of projects from OWOW, including projects from Orange County. The pre-application workshop occurred on August 14, 2019 and DWR followed up and submitted written feedback to SAWPA and the project proponents on September 6.

SAWPA and Dudek are working with each of the project proponents on the feedback from DWR. DWR’s feedback includes comments on ensuring projects were correctly categorized by project type such as a decision support tool, that appropriate coordination had been done with groundwater sustainability agencies per the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act, and that costs estimates for all budget categories will included. Staff is currently facilitating communication among Dudek and project proponents to incorporate the project comments received from DWR.

Attachments:
1. PowerPoint Presentation
OWOW Proposition 1 Round 1
Integrated Regional Water Management Project Grant Application and Related Agreements

OWOW Steering Committee
September 26, 2019

Round 1 Funding Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Area</th>
<th>Round 1 General Grant</th>
<th>Round 1 DAC Grant</th>
<th>Round 2 General Grant</th>
<th>Round 2 DAC Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana</td>
<td>$21,925,000</td>
<td>$2,205,000</td>
<td>$21,925,000</td>
<td>$4,095,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Total Round 1 funding allocation = $24.1 Million
• All overall project proposals must:
  • Address the most critical needs of the IRWM region,
  • Be consistent with Statewide Priorities,
  • Have an expected useful life, and
  • Have CEQA/permits acquired within 12 months of final grant award.

• All individual projects must:
  • Address the most critical needs of the IRWM region,
  • Be consistent with Statewide Priorities,
  • Have an expected useful life, and
  • Have CEQA/permits acquired within 12 months of final grant award.

• Address the most critical needs of the IRWM region,
• Be consistent with Statewide Priorities,
• Have an expected useful life, and
• Have CEQA/permits acquired within 12 months of final grant award.
Prop 1 IRWM Funding Allocation Per the North Orange County MOU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Area</th>
<th>Round 1 General Grant</th>
<th>Round 1 DAC Grant</th>
<th>Round 2 General Grant</th>
<th>Round 2 DAC Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana</td>
<td>$21,925,000</td>
<td>$2,205,000</td>
<td>$21,925,000</td>
<td>$4,095,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Region Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Region</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Round 1 General Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North OC</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$6,248,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Watershed</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>$12,497,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watershed-wide</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$2,082,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$21,925,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prop 1 Round 1 Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRWM Solicitation</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Lead</th>
<th>Grant Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OMOW</td>
<td>Replenish Big Bear</td>
<td>Big Bear Area Regional Wastewater Agency</td>
<td>$4,563,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evans Lake Tributary Restoration and</td>
<td>San Bernadino Valley Municipal Water District</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Camp Evans Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well 30 Wellhead Treatment Project</td>
<td>Monte Vista Water District</td>
<td>$3,433,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Comprehensive Landscape</td>
<td>Project Partners*</td>
<td>$2,767,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rebate Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Harvesting of Algal Biomass in</td>
<td>City of Lake Elsinore</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lake Elsinore - Pilot Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Ana Mountains Watershed</td>
<td>Cleveland National Forest</td>
<td>$497,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protection Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhancements to Watershed-Wide</td>
<td>Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water Budget Decision Support Tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint IEUA-JCSD Regional Water</td>
<td>Inland Empire Utilities Agency</td>
<td>$2,617,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recycling Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North OC</td>
<td>Groundwater Replenishment System</td>
<td>Orange County Water District</td>
<td>$3,595,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final Expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raitt &amp; Myrtle Park</td>
<td>City of Santa Ana</td>
<td>$2,359,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC SmartScape</td>
<td>Orange County Coastkeeper</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Grant Management (5% of Total Grant</td>
<td>Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority</td>
<td>$1,268,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Award)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$24,130,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MWDOC, BMWD, IEUA, SBVMWD, WMWD and Big Bear Lake Department of Water and Power.
Example of DWR Comments

**General Comments:**
- Need to ensure appropriate coordination has been done with groundwater sustainability agencies.
- Need to ensure costs estimates for all budget categories are included.
- Need to thoroughly describe how project(s) are an example of an innovative technology or practice.

**Project Eligibility:**
- Several project proponents are making changes to their budgets in order to ensure grant funding is provided to eligible tasks such as construction.
- The non-eligible tasks, such as education and recreation improvements, are being organized as additional cost share items.
- Even considering these comments, no projects were deemed ineligible.
Next Steps

• Dudek and SAWPA will compile and submit final application to DWR on November 1.
  • Final application to address DWR’s comments from workshop.
• DWR to approve application in early 2020.
• SAWPA-DWR grant agreement and SAWPA agreements with project proponents to be developed in early 2020.

Agreements to Be Executed

The successful eleven project lead's will each execute a separate Sub-Agreement with SAWPA that incorporates the provisions of the DWR-SAWPA Grant Agreement.
Questions
DATE: September 26, 2019
TO: OWOW Steering Committee
SUBJECT: Advocacy Efforts Regarding IRWM
PREPARED BY: Larry McKenney

RECOMMENDATION
Receive this informational report and provide input to SAWPA staff.

DISCUSSION
Early this year, ACWA decided it should develop and adopt new policy principles for integrated regional water management. ACWA had previously adopted policy principles in 2007 that dealt mainly with seeking to improve the grant program. The feeling was that IRWM has proven to be a valuable and important tool for managing water resources, but it has not been successful across the entire state, and that the Department of Water Resources should not back away from supporting the concept, but should renew its emphasis on the IRWM program.

ACWA has an IRWM subcommittee of its Water Management Committee that took on the task of writing new policy principles. Larry McKenney co-chairs the subcommittee. The subcommittee partnered with the Roundtable of Regions, a statewide coalition of IRWM regional water management groups, in which Mark Norton and SAWPA has long been a leader. The combined group developed initial draft principles and then met with key staff from DWR in April.

At the end of April, the Governor issued an executive order directing State agencies to develop a Water Resilience Portfolio, with the effort being led by the Resources Agency. The schedule for that effort is aggressive, with a final Portfolio planned to be submitted to the Governor by Thanksgiving. The Resources Agency called for public input by the beginning of September.

At the ACWA conference in May, DWR Director Karla Nemeth described DWR’s commitment to integrated thinking about water, saying that she was driving integration within the Department through reorganization, and that DWR was “all in on IRWM” at the regional level.

In other public comments during the summer, Resources Secretary Wade Crowfoot has included strong support for regional planning efforts and priority setting, saying that he envisions the State creating a framework to support such regional efforts, rather than driving water management from the top down. He and other leaders in the administration have been fully engaged in and supportive of the Voluntary Agreements process regarding the Bay Delta water quality control plan, and they acknowledge that approach as an example of integrated regional effort.

ACWA and the Roundtable of Regions accelerated their work on IRWM policy principles so that their work could feed the input ACWA would provide for the Portfolio. The new policy principles (attached) were adopted by the ACWA board in July. SAWPA and the Roundtable of Regions each subsequently submitted input for the Portfolio (attached), as did ACWA, and their comments feature strong support for
a renewed emphasis on IRWM as a program and for the concept of integrated planning and multiple benefit strategies as a path to resilience.

The leaders of the ACWA IRWM subcommittee and the Roundtable of Regions met on September 16 with DWR representatives to discuss ACWA’s new policy principles and the future of IRWM. DWR was represented by Deputy Director for IRWM, Kris Tjernell; the division heads for regional assistance and for planning; the head of the IRWM financial assistance program, and other staff members. Tjernell’s comments during the meeting included:

- Confirmed that DWR has undergone a significant reorganization in order to improve integration across previously distinct programs. He noted that within his group, which includes Planning and Regional Assistance, a third division was just created called Multi-Benefit Initiatives. He described the IRWM idea as being part of “the new DWR culture.”
- Recognizing IRWM’s uneven success across the State, and the lack of IRWM funding in the most recent water bond and other water bond proposals, IRWM needs to continue on the basis of it being a sound way of doing business, and not as something dependent on future bonds or legislation. He acknowledges that the benefits of IRWM may be measurable, but that there are also difficult to measure benefits, such as conflict avoidance. We need to work on better and more compelling explanations of the benefits of IRWM in terms of outcomes. He looks for results that would not have occurred without IRWM.
- He and his staff are working to identify the appropriate State role or niche in IRWM. He thought that one value the State can add is in the realm of long-term forecasting to support “pushing the envelope” on climate change response. Once appropriate State roles are identified, he asks whether the financial assistance program is designed to take them there. He wondered whether we were willing to accept more requirements and conditions with future grant funds.

In the discussing during the meeting, DWR was interested in working on alignment and coordination of different State grant programs, working toward regulatory alignment with the IRWM concept, clarifying or refreshing IRWM Plan standards with a view to facilitating DWR deference to decisions made by strong regions, and generally pursuing more of a partnership relationship between DWR and the IRWM regions.

It was also clear that DWR is not wedded to the idea of focusing on the existing regional water management groups or even of the existing form of the program. Tjernell asked incisive questions about reasons some regions fail, and about how regions should be defined and how “success” for IRWM should be defined. The Roundtable of Regions has collected some information on these topics and will work with ACWA to provide an evaluation and recommendations for improving IRWM in weaker regions.

The discussion produced numerous ideas for follow up and an agreement to plan for another meeting in December after the Portfolio is released. ACWA is working to ramp up IRWM advocacy in the next couple of months to further influence the Portfolio and to encourage the inclusion of funding for IRWM, or at least for integrated, multi-benefit strategies, in the various bond proposals that are being developed for next Spring.

Attachments:
1. ACWA IRWM Policy Principles
2. SAWPA Portfolio letter
3. Roundtable of Regions Portfolio letter
INTEGRATED REGIONAL
WATER MANAGEMENT
ACWA POLICY PRINCIPLES

PREAMBLE

Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) is a voluntary, collaborative effort to plan and implement water management solutions on a regional scale. State lawmakers created the IRWM Planning Act in 2002 to encourage local entities to improve water quality and water supply reliability to meet the state’s overall agricultural, domestic, industrial and environmental water needs. IRWM is an efficient model for water management planning. IRWM delivers higher value for investments by utilizing early and collaborative stakeholder processes and prioritizing funding for multi-benefit projects that help diversify a region’s water management portfolio. The public water agencies which have engaged in IRWM have significantly invested in this collaborative approach. IRWM provides a path forward to address many of California’s major water challenges.

Following are the Association of California Water Agencies’ IRWM Policy Principles:

1. Water resources are best managed by local jurisdictions to effectively and efficiently manage water quality and supplies. ACWA supports IRWM as a tool to assist local water agencies in solving short- and long-term water management challenges through an integrated planning approach.

2. IRWM integrates planning across water management sectors, including water supply, water quality, flood management, stormwater, and habitat restoration to achieve regional goals and objectives. Integrated planning results in multi-benefit projects developed in a time- and cost-efficient manner.

3. Local and regional scale planning through IRWM is integral to California’s comprehensive water management planning, providing a foundation for the state to achieve its coequal goals of improved water supply reliability and enhanced ecosystem health in an era of climate change.

4. IRWM is a hub for diverse stakeholder engagement at the regional scale. The collaborative partnerships attained through IRWM result in improved water management planning and project development, reducing potential conflicts, and forming regional leadership.

5. ACWA supports the continued use of IRWM governance structures, known as Regional Water Management Groups (RWMGs), to build on the well-established, inclusive stakeholder outreach and facilitation efforts through IRWM. RWMG stakeholder processes result in the balance of diverse interests within a region.
The Watersheds Coalition of Ventura County (IRWM Region) recently completed a collaborative process regarding the impacts of climate change on its region. This process, hosted through IRWM, began with a study conducted by climatologists at the Desert Research Institute who provided scaled down projections for future changes in climate based on accepted climate models. The results are informing development of adaptation strategies and selection of projects/programs for implementation. Two workshops and a series of small group meetings were conducted with local stakeholders and the researchers, resulting in new opportunities and methods to be climate resilient.

After seven years of writing the Upper Sacramento, McCloud and Lower Pit River IRWM Plan, a diverse group of stakeholders including municipalities, Tribes and community organizations have built an unprecedented level of trust and familiarity in Siskiyou County. With an established foundation for communication and a successful track record of funding projects, the IRWM stakeholders are strengthening their region’s capacity to respond appropriately to climate change. Important investments include funding grey and green infrastructure improvement projects in this critical source water area to replenish California’s high quality water supply and serve as a giant carbon sink for the state.

In the Santa Ana River watershed, the One Water, One Watershed (OWOW) Program used IRWM grants to encourage agencies to focus on actions to benefit the entire watershed. The result was the Santa Ana River Conservation and Conjunctive Use Project, which combines demand reduction with groundwater banking to increase resilience. The heart of the project is collaboration to optimize the use of multiple distinct groundwater basins in order to store imported water during wet years, and then produce dry year supplies to benefit all the partners. The partners include the five large water agencies in three different counties whose service areas comprise the entire urbanized part of the watershed.

CASE STUDIES

**Ventura IRWM**

The Watersheds Coalition of Ventura County (IRWM Region) recently completed a collaborative process regarding the impacts of climate change on its region. This process, hosted through IRWM, began with a study conducted by climatologists at the Desert Research Institute who provided scaled down projections for future changes in climate based on accepted climate models. The results are informing development of adaptation strategies and selection of projects/programs for implementation. Two workshops and a series of small group meetings were conducted with local stakeholders and the researchers, resulting in new opportunities and methods to be climate resilient.

**Upper Sacramento-McCloud IRWM**

After seven years of writing the Upper Sacramento, McCloud and Lower Pit River IRWM Plan, a diverse group of stakeholders including municipalities, Tribes and community organizations have built an unprecedented level of trust and familiarity in Siskiyou County. With an established foundation for communication and a successful track record of funding projects, the IRWM stakeholders are strengthening their region’s capacity to respond appropriately to climate change. Important investments include funding grey and green infrastructure improvement projects in this critical source water area to replenish California’s high quality water supply and serve as a giant carbon sink for the state.

**Mojave IRWM**

The Mojave IRWM region has partnered with a non-profit who specializes in assisting rural disadvantaged water systems. Through strong, transparent regional support and oversight via local IRWM plan governance structure, the regional Small Water Systems Assistance Program consistently delivers technical, managerial and financial support to these traditionally underserved utilities in an effort to make them sustainable moving forward. The Program consistently attracts financial support from a variety of local, state level and federal sources and serves approximately 40 disadvantaged small water systems in the region.

**Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority IRWM**

In the Santa Ana River watershed, the One Water, One Watershed (OWOW) Program used IRWM grants to encourage agencies to focus on actions to benefit the entire watershed. The result was the Santa Ana River Conservation and Conjunctive Use Project, which combines demand reduction with groundwater banking to increase resilience. The heart of the project is collaboration to optimize the use of multiple distinct groundwater basins in order to store imported water during wet years, and then produce dry year supplies to benefit all the partners. The partners include the five large water agencies in three different counties whose service areas comprise the entire urbanized part of the watershed.
6. RWMGs organize transparent processes that encourage the involvement of and input from underserved and disadvantaged communities (DACs), Tribes, environmental and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and interested stakeholders into local water resources decision-making, planning and management. ACWA supports the role of RWMGs in working with DACs, Tribes, academia and NGOs.

7. IRWM is a voluntary program that can help achieve regulatory compliance through project development and implementation. State or federal entities should streamline permit processes or allow flexibility on the development of regulatory requirements for projects supported by IRWM. Such regulatory alignment supports efficient, integrated water resource management.

8. Projects developed and funded through IRWM result in measurable benefits for local and regional entities. Benefits and regional data for these projects are recommended to be integrated with statewide water resource management efforts for accountability, stewardship and transparency purposes, where applicable.

9. Streamlined administrative practices are essential for continued success of IRWM. The Department of Water Resources, other state and federal funding agencies, and RWMGs must partner, analyze and improve the efficiency and consistency of current grant administration and plan review practices.

10. Successful implementation of IRWM throughout California will require continued federal, state, regional, local and private investments. ACWA further supports increased funding for IRWM and encourages funding entities to align funding criteria and cycles to encourage IRWM participation.

11. ACWA encourages RWMGs to leverage multiple funding sources of different types and purposes, including but not limited to funding from federal, state, local, public, and private sources. The development of diverse funding portfolios at the regional scale strengthens the ability for local entities to continue to develop integrated, multi-benefit solutions.

12. ACWA will continue to coordinate on IRWM with interested entities and encourages other statewide associations, local and regional entities, interest groups and the state to educate and collaboratively advocate regarding why IRWM enhances water resource planning and project development efforts statewide.

SGMA & IRWM Facilitation

Through IRWM, the Yuima Municipal Water District is facilitating the partnership of six water districts and resource conservation districts and the San Luis Rey Indian Water Authority, an intertribal organization formed by five San Luis Rey basin tribes. The groundwater sub-basin aquifers are depleted, putting stress on water supplies for the many overlying disadvantaged communities. These stakeholder engagement efforts are the first steps toward developing a Groundwater Sustainability Plan for the Upper San Luis Rey Valley Groundwater Sub-basin, located in the Pauma Valley in North San Diego County. Regional-scale stakeholder engagement through IRWM can continue to support SGMA efforts.

Inclusive Governance

The SOC Watershed Management Area (WMA) IRWM is a 22-member agency cooperative agreement comprising the backbone for the funding and governance structure for IRWM stakeholder activities that are developed and then successfully implemented through projects for the past decade. The IRWM Group and other NGO, regulatory and municipal representatives identified the need for a watershed-based, stakeholder-driven project development framework, providing opportunities for water, wastewater, stormwater, and groundwater representatives to coordinate on a regional scale with a data-driven planning process that helps meet statewide resiliency goals.
The City of Santa Barbara completed its Recycled Water Enhancement Project through IRWM planning and funding efforts. The Project supports regional priorities of protecting, conserving, and augmenting water supplies by upgrading the City’s recycled water plant in order to meet turbidity requirements so the City no longer needs to use potable “blend water” to serve its recycled water customers, thus reducing the City’s potable water demand by up to 990 acre-feet per year.

The Cosumnes, American, Bear, Yuba (CABY) IRWM group has successfully attracted more than $20 million from a variety of sources, including the California Department of Water Resources for a series of integrated water management programs, developing a broad funding portfolio. One example is the CABY-sponsored project at the Malakoff Diggins State Historic Park, a collaborative project with the state, U.S. Geological Survey, U.S. Forest Service, and The Sierra Fund assessing an historic gold mine for remediation to improve water quality in the Yuba River.

The Safe, Clean Water Program is a Los Angeles-based special property tax that passed by voters in November 2018. This Program was developed collaboratively with stakeholders to create an expenditure plan to implement eligible municipal, regional, and district-wide programs and projects for improved water supply, water quality and community investment. Implementation is ongoing and includes integrated regional governance committees, broad stakeholder input, DAC consideration, and transparency and accountability. The result from this Program will be up to $300 million in annual revenue starting in Spring 2020.

The Inyo-Mono IRWM Region received funding for a stream stabilization study for the Oak Creek watershed on the eastern slope of the Sierra Nevada in collaboration with the Inyo National Forest and the Fort Independence Indian Reservation. The study serves as the planning foundation for the restoration of the Oak Creek watershed, which experienced a severe flood and mudslide following a fire in the watershed in previous years.
August 30, 2019

Ms. Nancy Vogel
Director of the Governor’s Water Portfolio Program
California Natural Resources Agency
1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1311
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: SAWPA’s Input to California’s Water Resilience Portfolio Initiative

Dear Ms. Vogel:

The Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority (SAWPA) appreciates the opportunity to offer input to the Governor’s Water Resilience Portfolio. SAWPA is a joint powers authority that focuses on a broad range of water resource issues including water supply reliability, water quality improvement, recycled water, wastewater treatment, groundwater management, brine disposal, and integrated regional planning. SAWPA’s service area spans the 2,840-square-mile Santa Ana River watershed, which contains a population of over 6 million people in northern Orange County and the Inland Empire region. The Santa Ana River watershed is also designated as the Santa Ana IRWM funding area, and SAWPA leads the region’s Department of Water Resources-approved IRWM Program.

SAWPA strongly believes that California’s Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Program should be the major venue for local agencies to rank and determine priority projects that are generated through California’s Water Resilience Portfolio Initiative. Once the statewide priorities are identified through the portfolio’s inventory and assessment process, SAWPA recommends that IRWM regions across the State serve as the venue to engage public agencies, non-profits, and other local stakeholders so important projects that implement the portfolio’s priorities can be collaboratively identified and funded. With 48 State-recognized IRWM Regions, approximately 87% of the State’s land area, and 99% of the population are contained within a region. Governor Gavin Newsom’s Executive Order N-10-19 embodies priorities such as concentrating on multi-benefit approaches and encouraging regional collaboration among water users within a watershed. The IRWM regions are well positioned to work with state agencies tasked with implementing the portfolio and local stakeholders.

Benefits of using the IRWM regions for implementing the portfolio include:

- IRWM regions have existing networks of disadvantaged community representatives, water agencies, flood control agencies, non-profits, resource conservation districts, etc.;
- IRWM regions are currently engaged in implementing the Proposition 1 Disadvantaged Communities Involvement Program, which should be a focus in addressing the Human Right to Water going forward;
• IRWM regions have strong existing relationships with key State agencies involved with water, particularly the California Department of Water Resources, the State’s lead agency for IRWM, as well as the State Water Resources Control Board and the California Regional Water Quality Control Boards;
• IRWM regions have existing regional governance structures that achieve consensus on regional priorities while accounting for State goals, and approve long-term planning documents such as IRWM plans;
• IRWM regions represent an existing, developed mechanism for the State to optimize its investment of funds and resources in projects that already have local political and financial support, which is key since 85% of water investment comes from local agencies;
• IRWM regions accommodate the fact that California is diverse and that different regions have different needs and priorities, yet they have developed an existing State-wide network known as the Roundtable of Regions that coordinates planning across regions, with the Department of Water Resources, and with other state-wide organizations like the Association of California Water Agencies (ACWA) and the California Stormwater Quality Association;
• While developing long-range assessments of water demands and supplies, IRWM regions have already been required to evaluate the potential effects of climate change and develop strategies to address those effects;
• Several IRWM regions have partnered with DWR to develop watershed sustainability tracking tools and the metrics of success for IRWM projects through various region-wide and project-specific indicators, and the regions are working with DWR to use these examples as models for statewide use; and
• IRWM regions have ranked and collaboratively identified priority projects, proposed by local agencies and stakeholders, that meet State grant eligibility requirements and intersect with State and local IRWM plan goals. These projects illustrate how the State can work to achieve its goals through regional actions in ways that are collaborative and that resolve conflict.

About IRWM Planning

There are two basic aspects of IRWM planning – first, an integrated, balanced approach to water resource management that seeks to break down jurisdictional and institutional barriers that could limit multi-benefit and innovative approaches; second – a structure and process to evaluate and prioritize regional multi-benefit projects. Per statute, IRWM Plans must assess anticipated impacts from climate change on groundwater, surface water, natural resources, water supply resiliency and environmental justice, all of which are vital to an integrated water management approach. While results have varied across the state, the IRWM regions have refined and improved their efforts for a decade or more and improving and reinforcing this strategy will be better than creating a new regional approach for the portfolio. The IRWM program is also designed to encourage integrated regional strategies for management of water resources by directing funding to projects and programs that support integrated water management. They focus available grant funding and significant local and federal funding on projects included in long-term IRWM plans, such as conjunctive
use water management, habitat and ecological improvements, watershed management, flood protection and decision support tools.

About SAWPA and IRWM Planning in the Santa Ana River Watershed

Through its IRWM Program called One Water, One Watershed (OWOW), SAWPA works with stakeholders to prioritize multi-benefit, regional projects. This is done through updates to the long-term OWOW (IRWM) Plans as well as on a project-by-project basis through various “calls for projects,” historically driven by rounds of State grant funding. SAWPA developed the OWOW Plan, and has completed two major updates to the Plan, through a stakeholder process that coordinates with many of the 100+ water districts in the watershed, and with local, regional, state and federal agencies, and public/private stakeholder groups. At the same time, SAWPA is actively implementing the Proposition 1 Santa Ana River Watershed Disadvantaged Community Involvement Program, which strengthens the stakeholder process in a new way.

The IRWM approach is an effective business model for the management of water resources for sustainability and resilience. A key concept is that, while the approach requires a significant investment in stakeholder processes initially, ultimate implementation of the results of the plan occurs efficiently because conflicts are minimized, and resources are focused on agreed-upon priorities. For example, in the first round of competitive IRWM Proposition 1 funding, SAWPA used “participatory budgeting” to determine which projects should receive $16.7 million IRWM grant funding in the Santa Ana River Watershed region. After 30 projects were submitted through a call for projects in early 2019, SAWPA held a “Let’s Connect” workshop to allow watershed stakeholders to learn about projects and encourage project proponents to find linkages between their projects and possibly combine their projects with others. After several projects combined, SAWPA released a preliminary ranking of all projects by scoring them based on their nexus to the IRWM’s goals, using a scoring process that was previously approved through a public process.

SAWPA led three additional workshops to allow the applicants to articulate and justify the project benefits they claimed and to allow other stakeholders to challenge assumptions. The workshops were open to all applicants and stakeholders throughout the watershed. SAWPA then re-ranked the projects using the updated benefit amounts. In a final workshop SAWPA recommended an allocation of the available grant funding whereby each project received a proportional share of the funding based on their percentage of the points scored. This last step of allocating grant funding was expected to be a contentious, but since the stakeholders had already deliberated and justified their project’s benefits in an open table format, the re-ranking of the project was largely accepted by the project proponents and stakeholders.

With this example of collaboration, SAWPA strongly believes that California’s IRWM Program should be the major venue for local agencies to rank and determine priority projects that are generated through California’s Water Resilience Portfolio Initiative. Each region has developed its own mechanisms for surveying resource needs, prioritizing goals, and vetting projects, because each region is significantly
different in many ways. But the process is superior to traditional subject matter silos, disconnected grant programs, and conflicts.

Through the Portfolio, the State could better ensure that the positive results of IRWM contribute to achieving water resilience goals, especially related to climate change and the Human Right to Water, by:

- Recommitting to the IRWM approach as a central aspect of the State’s water resources strategy;
- Refreshing IRWM Plan standards to ensure Plans will meet State expectations, while still honoring regional priorities;
- Investing in making data more functional for all users from State agencies to local stakeholders, by developing understandable, public-facing data platforms and workable data protocols;
- Striving to achieve regulatory alignment among State and federal resources agencies, so that projects and actions that result from IRWM can be implemented with enough certainty to encourage investment from various kinds of funding sources; and
- Continuing to use general obligation bond funds to incentivize and support IRWM processes.

If you have any questions about the process used for Proposition 1 Round 1 in the Santa Ana River Watershed, or any of the benefits of using IRWM listed in this letter, please contact Mark Norton, SAWPA’s Water Resources and Planning Manager. He is available at (951) 354-4221, or mnorton@sawpa.org.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments about the benefits of IRWM and its nexus to California’s Water Resilience Portfolio.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Richard E. Haller, P.E., ENV SP
General Manager
September 4, 2019

Nancy Vogel
Director of the Governor’s Water Portfolio Program
1303 10th St., Suite 1173
Sacramento, CA 95814

Submitted electronically to: input@waterresilience.ca.gov

Re: California Water Resilience Portfolio Initiative

Dear Ms. Vogel:

We are writing on behalf of the Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Roundtable of Regions (Roundtable) to support the Governor's Water Resilience Portfolio Initiative and to provide input on the Portfolio’s development. The Roundtable is a statewide network of representatives from organizations and agencies engaged in the implementation of IRWM.

IRWM is a collaborative effort to identify and implement water management solutions on a regional scale. The practice of IRWM in California was significantly advanced when the California Legislature passed the IRWM Planning Act of 2002. Forty-eight IRWM planning regions were formed and subsequently reviewed and accepted by the State. Today, IRWM regions cover more than 87 percent of the State's land area and 99 percent of its population. Regional Water Management Groups (RWMGs) govern the majority of the IRWM regions.

IRWM is essential for integrating regional, local and even State water efforts to achieve sustainable water management in the most effective and cost-efficient manner. Among its many attributes, IRWM fosters cooperative decision-making, multi-benefit approaches, efficient use of resources, conflict reduction and resolution, increased regional self-reliance, financial leveraging, pooled funding, and the sustainable management of water and related natural resources to concurrently achieve social, environmental, and economic objectives1.

One of the key principals of IRWM is collaboration supported by open, inclusive, and transparent stakeholder involvement processes. This advanced form of collaboration is essential for building trust, fostering relationships, and reducing conflicts. IRWM region stakeholders include state, local and federal agencies; water providers; wastewater agencies; flood control agencies, resource conservation districts, environmental and other community organizations, disadvantaged and other under-represented communities, Tribes, groundwater management agencies, academics, and business and labor leaders.

1http://content.yudu.com/A2991hlpg.to.irwm/resources/index.htm?referrerUrl=http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/other_resources/publications.cfm&skipFlashCheck=true
The Roundtable sees Governor Newsom’s Executive Order N-10-19 as another great step forward in the advancement of water management practices in California, in part because water portfolio management is, in essence, one of the main purposes of IRWM. We are very encouraged by the Governor's directive that the portfolio initiative be supported by an “extensive outreach” effort. We have pledged our support for this effort and will work closely with the State to help inform the portfolio development process at the state level. We will also help identify measures necessary to strengthen IRWM and regional water management portfolios throughout California.

The following are our initial, high-level recommendations for the Portfolio. These recommendations have been coordinated with the California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA) and are they aligned with the Association of California Water Agencies' (ACWA) IRWM Policy Principles². We anticipate that additional, regionally specific recommendations will be provided by RWMGs representing individual IRWM regions.

1. **The state should adopt IRWM as the principal framework for implementing the Portfolio.** A lot of progress has been achieved though State, Tribal, regional, and local investments in IRWM but there is more to be achieved. The Portfolio will build on the investments made and progress achieved to date.

   There is broad support for the practice of IRWM statewide. Roundtable and California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA) leadership are working to establish collaborative opportunities between the two groups to more holistically integrate stormwater management with regional, multi-benefit planning and implementation. This is further evidenced in the commitments CASQA has made to better integrate stormwater and IRWM planning in their Strategic Plan and Vision and Strategic Actions for Managing Stormwater in the 21st Century³. The latter makes recommendations for improving integrated planning of stormwater through IRWM Plans.

   ACWA’s new IRWM Policy Principles⁴ also illustrate the value of IRWM as a comprehensive approach that local water agencies and other stakeholders can use in overall water management planning. As stated in the ACWA principles, “The collaborative partnerships attained through IRWM result in improved water management planning and project development, reducing potential conflicts, and forming regional leadership.” IRWM RWMGs “organize transparent processes that encourage the involvement of and input from underserved and disadvantaged communities, tribes, environmental and non-governmental organizations and interested stakeholders into local water resources decision-making, planning and management.”

   The Department of Water Resources (DWR) California Water Plan Update 2018⁵ states that “holistically managing California natural resources will require collaboration among stakeholders” and cites IRWM RWMGs as among the options to encourage effective collaboration.

---

among diverse interests. The DWR-published Stakeholder Perspectives – Recommendations for Sustaining and Strengthening Integrated Regional Water Management notes that IRWM provides synergistic opportunities for resiliency planning. IRWM regions cover most of the area of the state and can provide a suitable forum for implementation of other multi-stakeholder planning efforts.

2. **We recommend the state work across agencies and with IRWM Regions to continue to fund regional, multi-benefit planning and projects and to highlight case examples of success stories.** IRWM Regions are an appropriate, locally-driven means to implement the Portfolio’s specific elements, with a successful track record for implementing multi-benefit water resource project portfolios. Working through the Regions, the state’s IRWM Grant Program has funded more than 840 projects providing multiple benefits such as improved water quality, increased resiliency to climate change, better flood management, restored and enhanced ecosystems, and more reliable local surface and groundwater supplies. IRWM has provided a high rate of return on these investments of public funds: portfolio approaches implemented by IRWM groups at the local level represent an investment of 3.5 times that of the state through local grant funding match and coordinated project planning (approximately $4.2 billion local versus $1.3 billion state).

3. **We recommend the state work with interested stakeholders to recognize the primary benefits and values of IRWM that would best meet the specific needs identified for the Portfolio.** The Roundtable strongly believes the primary benefits of utilizing existing IRWM Regions for implementing the portfolio include:

   - **Cross-industry and dynamic stakeholder representation:** IRWM Regions have existing networks of Tribal and disadvantaged community representatives, water agencies, flood control agencies, non-profits, resource conservation districts, etc.

   - **Existing coordination role with State agencies:** IRWM Regions have existing relationships and an ongoing dialogue with the California Department of Water Resources, the State’s lead agency for IRWM. The Regions are concurrently working to establish relationships with State Water Resources Control Board staff through CASQA to find opportunities to coordinate Strategy to Optimize Resource Management of Stormwater (STORMS) and IRWM planning.

   - **Established governance for multi-benefit project planning:** IRWM Regions have existing regional governance structures responsible for long-term planning such as developing IRWM Plans, as well identification and selection of projects for submission to the State and other granting entities for funding assistance.

   - **Grass-roots representation, coordinated state-wide:** IRWM Regions have an existing State-wide network in the Roundtable that coordinates planning across regions, with the Department of Water Resources, and with other state-wide organizations like the Association of California Water Agencies (ACWA) and CASQA. Additionally, 77% of respondents in a recent Roundtable membership poll indicated that their Region coordinates with their local Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) processes.

---

6. [https://water.ca.gov/LegacyFiles/irwm/docs/IRWM_Recommendations.pdf](https://water.ca.gov/LegacyFiles/irwm/docs/IRWM_Recommendations.pdf)
• **IRWM plays a role in regional resiliency and climate change planning:** IRWM Regions have done assessments and 20-year planning estimates of water demands and supplies, analyzed climate impacts on regional infrastructure and identified mitigation responses, and surveyed and identified priority actions for disadvantaged communities.

• **Project tracking and data management:** IRWM Regions track progress toward achieving watershed sustainability and the success of grant-funded IRWM projects through various region-wide and project-specific indicators; these data can be organized at the Regional level and funneled up to state data tracking tools (e.g. the Water Sustainability Atlas).

• **Established multi-benefit, multi-sector stakeholder project prioritization:** IRWM Regions have ranked and collaboratively identified priority projects, proposed by local agencies and stakeholders, which meet State grant eligibility requirements and intersect with State and local IRWM plan goals that align with Statewide Objectives, Resource Management Strategies, and the requested elements of the Portfolio.

4. **We recommend the state work with the Roundtable, IRWM Regions, and other interested stakeholders to continue to address vulnerable communities.** We recognize that collaboration through IRWM can be challenging, particularly in large rural regions with a high percentage of disadvantaged communities. Though challenging, the IRWM framework provides an extremely effective (and sometimes the only) mechanism for bring rural disadvantaged community and Tribal voices to the statewide table, identifying their needs, and providing technical assistance to develop and implement critical projects that bring benefits not only to those communities but also to the rest of the state.

5. **We recommend the state review the successes, barriers, and survey results related to IRWM with the Roundtable, local RWMGs, and other interested stakeholders.** The Roundtable conducted a survey of our members in the past month to obtain their input on whether IRWM is the appropriate platform for implementing the Portfolio, recognize what’s working, and identify the barriers to success. Ninety-seven percent of those responding – representing most of the population of the state - said that IRWM is the best framework for implementing the Portfolio. The primary barriers identified were competition for limited funding, lack of funding for IRWM staffing and coordination, and, in some cases, physical distance from other stakeholders. Respondents also provided testimonials regarding how IRWM has worked in their regions.

We would appreciate the opportunity to share these survey results with you as you prepare the recommendations. We believe these barriers can be addressed by working together across the state to support and enhance the practice of IRWM.

---

7 Vulnerability analyses are required in the IRWM Plan Standards, at a minimum these must be equivalent to the equivalent assessment in the DWR Climate Change Handbook for Regional Water Planning, Section 4 and Appendix B. This is further described in the IRWM Proposition 1 IRWM Program Guidelines – Volume 2 - IRWM Planning Standards (pgs 42-43, 69-72).

6. We recommend the state form a diverse, stakeholder advisory group to prioritize future implementation actions related to IRWM. A stakeholder advisory group would assist the agencies in prioritizing actions to ensure safe and dependable water supplies, flood protection, and healthy waterways for the state’s communities, economy, and environment. In addition, the advisory group would be well positioned to promote inter-regional cooperation and collaboration, and identify and resolve barriers to integrated water management planning and implementation. Please see recommendations 2, 3, 4 and 5 above for specific topics to be addressed by this advisory group.

In summary, we request consideration of the value of the planning components of IRWM and the need for additional support for the existing, extensive and successful regional planning efforts. We strongly urge the agencies preparing the Portfolio recommendations to draw from regions successfully practicing IRWM governance and project planning as models and/or a template for implementation in areas where IRWM has not been as successfully realized.

As the state agencies developing the Water Resilience Portfolio carry out their assignment, it is imperative that the approach to water resiliency is integrative across all aspects of water resources management. With a rapidly changing climate and associated risks on the horizon, agencies’ first reaction could be to use familiar, traditional approaches from the past – by reinforcing established regulatory silos and attempting to address problems in a piecemeal fashion. The Water Resilience Portfolio must provide flexibility and highlight existing tools that provide a blueprint for coordination and communication across agencies and with stakeholders to achieve wide-ranging, mutual goals. IRWM satisfies the broad structure of regional collaboration necessary to assist the state in developing and implementing the Portfolio and serves as an effective umbrella for water resources management.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on development of the Water Resilience Portfolio. If you have any questions or wish to discuss these ideas further, please contact our Network Coordinator, Jodie Monaghan, at jodie@jmconsultants.net or (916) 616-1134.

Respectfully,

Lynn Rodriguez
Co-Chair

Mark Stadler
Co-Chair

Attachment: Map of IRWM Regions and Funding Areas

cc via email: IRWM Roundtable of Regions Network members
Wade Crowfoot, Secretary for Natural Resources, California Natural Resources Agency (secretary@resources.ca.gov)
Karen Ross, Secretary of Agriculture, California Department of Food and Agriculture (secretary.ross@cdfa.ca.gov)
Jared Blumenfeld, Secretary for Environmental Protection, California Environmental Protection Agency (jared.blumenfeld@calepa.ca.gov)
Cindy Messer, DWR Chief Deputy Director, (Cindy.Messer@water.ca.gov)
Kristopher Tjernell, Deputy Director of DWR Integrated Watershed Management Program (Kristopher.Tjernell@water.ca.gov)
Arthur Hinojosa, Chief of DWR Integrated Regional Water Management Division (Arthur.Hinojosa@water.ca.gov)
Erik Eckdahl, SWRCB Deputy Director (Erik.Ekdahl@waterboards.ca.gov)
Jenny Lester Moffitt, CDFA Undersecretary (Jenny.LesterMoffitt@cdfa.ca.gov)
Joe Yun, California Water Commission, (joseph.yun@water.ca.gov)
Legend

IRWM Regions

DWR Funding Areas

Central Coast
Colorado River Basin
Los Angeles Sub-Region
Mountain Counties
North Coast
North/South Lahontan
Sacramento River
San Diego Sub-Region
San Francisco Bay Area
San Joaquin River
Santa Ana Sub-Region
Tulare/Kern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>IRWM Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Greater Monterey County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>San Gorgonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>East Contra Costa County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kings Basin Water Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Poso Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Santa Cruz County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sacramento Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Upper Pit River Watershed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Santa Barbara County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Cosumnes, American, Bear, Yuba (CABY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Upper Santa Margarita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Watersheds Coalition of Ventura County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Westside (Yolo, Solano, Napa, Lake, Colusa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Gateway Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>North Sacramento Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Antelope Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Monterey Peninsula-Carmel Bay-So Monterey Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Upper Sacramento-McCloud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Fremont Basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Westside - San Joaquin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>North Coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Madera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>South Orange County WMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mojave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Pajaro River Watershed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Tuolumne-Stanislaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>San Francisco Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Lahontan Basins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Merced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Coachella Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Tulare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>American River Basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Greater Los Angeles County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Southern Sierra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Yuba County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Tahoe-Sierra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Eastern San Joaquin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Upper Feather River Watershed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Yosemite - Mariposa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Kaweah River Basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Imperial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Kern County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Anza Borrego Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Upper Santa Clara River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Mokelumne/Amador/Calaveras (MAC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>East Stanislaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Inyo-Mono</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: September 26, 2019

TO: OWOW Steering Committee

SUBJECT: Proposition 84 Round 2 Implementation Grant Agreement Amendment

PREPARED BY: Marie Jauregui, Project Manager

RECOMMENDATION
Receive and file.

DISCUSSION
Several projects in this funding round have requested changes to their scopes, budgets, or schedules.

Project 2: Perris Desalination Program – Brackish Water Well 94 (EMWD)

Scope of Work
EMWD has requested removing the 90% plans and specifications for equipping of the well deliverable under Task 3.2 from their scope as this deliverable is specific to Wells 95 and 96. At the time the design was at the 90% level, the US Army Corps of Engineers was constructing Wells 95 and 96. Well 94 was added later as a change order and therefore only included as part of the 100% plans and specs for the combined drilling and equipping project.

Budget
No changes.

Schedule
No changes.

Project 4: Forest First – Increase Stormwater Capture and Decrease Sediment Loading through Forest Ecological Restoration (US Forest Service)

Scope of Work
No changes.

Budget
Most of the remaining work for this project is in Budget Categories A (Project Administration) and D (Construction/Implementation). As such, the US Forest Service requested that $24,000 in grant funds be shifted from Budget Category C (Design) to Budget Category A (Project Administration). The overall total project cost remains the same.

Tables 1 shows the current project budget, and Table 2 shows the project budget after the amendment.
Table 1 Current Budget Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Category</th>
<th>Requested Grant Amount</th>
<th>Required Funding Match</th>
<th>Additional Cost Share</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Project Administration</td>
<td>$11,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Land Purchase/Easement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Planning / Design / Engineering / Env. Doc</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>203,487</td>
<td>559,513</td>
<td>803,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Construction / Implementation</td>
<td>948,500</td>
<td>1,851,552</td>
<td>1,934,608</td>
<td>4,734,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Grand Total</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>2,055,039</td>
<td>2,499,121</td>
<td>5,554,160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Budget Breakdown after Amendment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Category</th>
<th>Requested Grant Amount</th>
<th>Required Funding Match</th>
<th>Additional Cost Share</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Project Administration</td>
<td>$35,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$35,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Land Purchase/Easement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Planning / Design / Engineering / Env. Doc</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>203,487</td>
<td>564,513</td>
<td>784,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Construction / Implementation</td>
<td>948,500</td>
<td>1,851,552</td>
<td>1,934,608</td>
<td>4,734,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Grand Total</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>2,055,039</td>
<td>2,499,121</td>
<td>5,554,160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schedule
No changes.

Project 10: Enhanced Stormwater Capture and Recharge along the Santa Ana River (SBVMWD)

Scope of Work
SBVMWD requested that Phases 1b and 1c scope of their project be reduced due to schedule delays and the ability to complete the project within the timeline of the grant. The original scope was broken out into two phases – Phase 1a and Phase 1b. Once Phase 1a and Phase 1b are complete, the facilities would be in place to divert and recharge up to 80,000 acre-feet (AF) in a single year as well as accommodate an instantaneous flow of 500 cubic feet per second (cfs).

Phase 1a is the work that was outside of the Upper Santa Ana Wash Land Management and Habitat Conservation Plan (Wash Plan HCP). It includes some improvements to the Cuttle Weir, a new sedimentation basin and a portion of the Plunge Pool Pipeline between the new sedimentation basin and the existing Foothill Pipeline. These facilities accommodate the diversion and recharge of up to 32,000 AF in a single year and an instantaneous flow of 200 cfs.

Phase 1b is the work located inside the Wash Plan HCP and cannot be constructed until the Wash Plan HCP is complete. It includes additional canal, recharge basins and associated facilities. Until recently, Phase 1b also included additional intake improvements at the Cuttle Weir that will facilitate debris removal during high flows. However, the environmental review and permitting for these improvements is
expected to take longer than the environmental permitting for the rest of Phase 1b. Rather than delay the rest of the Phase 1b improvements, the additional improvements to Cuttle Weir have been moved into a separate phase – Phase 1c.

When the project was included in the Grant Agreement, it was anticipated that construction of Phases 1b and 1c would commence around the time the Wash Plan HCP was originally scheduled to be completed (July 2015). The Wash Plan will support an incidental take permit for many different projects. However, it required approval of a federal land exchange, which was approved by the US Congress on March 12, 2019. As part of that approval, the Wash Plan HCP will require review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). NEPA and final design of the Wash Plan elements are not expected to be complete until March 2020, which is estimated to delay the construction of Phases 1b and 1c until 2021 or 2022.

**Budget**

By removing Phases 1b and 1c from the scope, the total project costs will be reduced by more than half. It goes from approximately $31.3 Million to $13.2 Million.

**Schedule**

No changes. The removal of Phases 1b and 1c do not impact the schedule.

SAWPA staff will prepare a redlined agreement for the proposed Amendment No. 4 and submit to DWR for review and approval. Once the changes are approved by DWR, it is anticipated an executed agreement would be received by early 2020.

Currently, 11 of 18 Round 2 projects are complete or substantial complete. Recently, SAWPA has received concerns from the City of Riverside, City of Yucaipa and San Bernardino Water Conservation District that they are experiencing delays in completing their projects. SAWPA staff is in the process of meeting with each agency to obtain an understanding of their scheduling issues and determine if an additional change in scope or schedule is needed.

**CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS**

The following OWOW critical success factors are addressed by this action:

1. Administration of the OWOW process and plan in a highly efficient and cost-effective manner.
2. Data and information needed for decision-making is available to all.

**RESOURCE IMPACTS**

The changes proposed to the project will result in a DWR amendment and modifications to the sub-agreements. The SAWPA labor time associated with these changes will be charged to SAWPA’s grant administration budget for Prop 84 Round 2 grant program and sufficient funding has been budgeted for such changes.

Attachments:
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### Proposition 84 Project Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round</th>
<th>No. of Projects</th>
<th>Projects Complete*</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Grant Invoiced</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$12.0M</td>
<td>$12.0 M</td>
<td>$261M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$14.5M</td>
<td>$9.3M</td>
<td>$152M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drought Round</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$12.0M</td>
<td>$7.7M</td>
<td>$23M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Implementation Round</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$61.0M</td>
<td>$20.8M</td>
<td>$302M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>$99.5M</strong></td>
<td><strong>$49.8M</strong></td>
<td><strong>$737M</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes projects that are substantially complete
Projected Watershed-Wide Benefits of All Four Rounds of OWOW Prop 84 IRWM Projects

- Reduces water demand by 18,000 AFY representing 36,000 households
- Recharges 180,000 AF of additional imported water
- Produces 18,000 AFY of desalted groundwater
- Removes 29,000 tons of salt from groundwater per year
- Creates 11,000 AFY of additional recycled water
- Captures 44,000 AFY of stormwater for beneficial use
- Restores 3,800 acres of environmental habitat
- Reduces nonpoint source pollution by 29,000 pounds per year
- Reduces flood risk damage by $91 million
- Creates about 11,000 construction related jobs
Round 1 Projects
(August 2011 – June 2019)

A: GWRS Flow Equalization (OCWD)
B: Sludge, Dewatering, Odor Control & Primary Sludge Thickening (CCSD)
C: Santa Ana Watershed Upland Monitoring (SAWMA)
D: Mill Creek Wetlands (Ontario)
E: Gadsden Basin (SCCFC)
F: Island Empire Brea Line Rehabilitation / Enhancement (SAWPA)
G: Afton Credit Interconnection Project (C. Corona)
H: Perchlorate Wellhead Treatment System Pipelines (WVWD)
I: Chino Creek Wellfield Development Project (WMWD)
J: Impaired Groundwater Recovery (IRWD)
K: Palo Verde River Basin Development Project (OCWD)
L: Chino Creek Wellfield Development Project (WMWD)
Proposition 84 Round 1
Project Status Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Required Funding Match</th>
<th>Add'l Cost Share</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>% Project Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant Agreement Administration</td>
<td>SAWPA</td>
<td>$660,004</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$660,004</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWRS Flow Equalization</td>
<td>OCWD</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,180,760</td>
<td>7.67%</td>
<td>$13,218,920</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sludge, Dewatering, Odor Control &amp; Primary Sludge Thickening</td>
<td>OCSD</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$36,638,218</td>
<td>26.00%</td>
<td>$103,278,005</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana Watershed Vireo Monitoring</td>
<td>SAWA</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$225,994</td>
<td>26.00%</td>
<td>$43,213</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Creek Wetlands</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,615,000</td>
<td>8.85%</td>
<td>$15,635,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 $13,218,920 in Other State Funds
2 $15,420,000 in Other State Funds

Proposition 84 Round 1
Project Status Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Required Funding Match</th>
<th>Add'l Cost Share</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>% Project Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cactus Basin</td>
<td>SBCFCD</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$4,427,155</td>
<td>29.96%</td>
<td>$9,350,026</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Empire Brine Line Rehabilitation / Enhancement</td>
<td>SAWPA</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$698,153</td>
<td>10.07%</td>
<td>$5,234,576</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Desalter Interconnection Project</td>
<td>Corona</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$350,493</td>
<td>26.00%</td>
<td>$597,556</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perris II Desalination Facility</td>
<td>EMWD</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$607,296</td>
<td>26.00%</td>
<td>$728,456</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perchlorate Wellhead Treatment System Pipelines</td>
<td>WVWD</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$368,940</td>
<td>26.00%</td>
<td>$50,060</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 $5,234,576 in Other State Funds
## Proposition 84 Round 1
### Project Status Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Required Funding Match</th>
<th>Add'l Cost Share</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>% Project Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chino Creek Wellfield Development Project</td>
<td>WMWD</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,646,091 26.00%</td>
<td>$3,685,027</td>
<td>$6,331,118</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired Groundwater Recovery</td>
<td>IRWD</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$20,148,848 53.99%</td>
<td>$16,173,122</td>
<td>$37,321,970</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alamitos Barrier Improvement Project</td>
<td>OCWD</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$650,600 5.61%</td>
<td>$9,956,000*</td>
<td>$11,606,600</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Basin Water Quality Improvement Project</td>
<td>WMWD</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$900,000 33.21%</td>
<td>$809,670</td>
<td>$2,709,670</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$12,660,004</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,457,548 26.69%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$178,759,631</strong></td>
<td><strong>$260,217,179</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $9,956,000 in Other State Funds

---

### Round 2 Projects

(February 2014 – December 2020)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Required Funding Match</th>
<th>Add'l Cost Share</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>% Grant Billed</th>
<th>% Constr. Complete</th>
<th>% Project Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant Agreement Administration</td>
<td>SAWPA</td>
<td>$627,405</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$627,405</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perris Desalination Program Well 94</td>
<td>EMWD</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$9,238,280</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quail Valley Subarea 9 Phase I Sewer System</td>
<td>EMWD</td>
<td>$1,930,000</td>
<td>$2,960,000 37.00%</td>
<td>$3,110,000</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest First</td>
<td>USFS</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$2,005,039 37.00%</td>
<td>$2,499,121</td>
<td>$5,554,160</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winneville Regional Recycled Water Pipeline/GLW Recharge System Upgrades</td>
<td>IEUA</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$28,500,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$29,500,000 in Other State Funds

Legend:
- Green – Project on schedule or ahead of schedule
- Yellow/Green – Delay experienced but will finish prior to Grant Completion Date
- Yellow – Delay experienced, not on schedule, unsure if project will complete on time
- Orange/Red – Project behind schedule, unsure if project will complete on time, or requires additional information
### Proposition 84 Round 2
Project Status Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Required Funding Match</th>
<th>Add'l Cost Share</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>% Grant Billed</th>
<th>% Constr. Complete</th>
<th>% Project Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plunge Creek Water Recharge and Habitat Improvement</td>
<td>SBVWCD</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$184,731 26.00%</td>
<td>$25,769</td>
<td>$710,500</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prado Basin Sediment Mgmt Demonstration Project</td>
<td>OCWD</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$1,444,000 37.00%</td>
<td>$1,704,000</td>
<td>$3,898,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Sevaine GW Recharge Basin</td>
<td>IEUA</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$925,001 32.34%</td>
<td>$1,184,999</td>
<td>$2,860,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corona/Home Gardens Multi-Jurisdictional Wtr Transmission Line</td>
<td>Corona</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>$2,327,494 37.00%</td>
<td>$2,663,031</td>
<td>$6,290,525</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced SW Capture/Recharge Along the SAR</td>
<td>SBVMWD</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$11,581,000 37.00%</td>
<td>$18,719,000</td>
<td>$31,300,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Residential Landscape Retrofit</td>
<td>IEUA</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$370,000 37.00%</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon Lake Hybrid Treatment Process</td>
<td>LES/JWA</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$327,635 37.00%</td>
<td>$57,865</td>
<td>$885,500</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Handbook to Using Water Efficiently</td>
<td>WMWD</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$42,000 25.93%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$162,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Day Basin</td>
<td>IEUA</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$1,531,171 37.00%</td>
<td>$1,857,130</td>
<td>$4,138,301</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- Green – Project on schedule or ahead of schedule
- Yellow/Green – Delay experienced but will finish prior to Grant Completion Date
- Yellow – Delay experienced, not on schedule, unsure if project will complete on time
- Orange/Red – Project behind schedule, unsure if project will complete on time, or requires additional information
### Proposition 84 Round 2 Project Status Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Required Funding</th>
<th>Add'l Cost</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>% Grant Billed</th>
<th>% Constr. Complete</th>
<th>% Project Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CII Performance Based WUE Program</td>
<td>MWDOC</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$898,179 37.00%</td>
<td>$1,029,333</td>
<td>$2,427,512</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peters Canyon Channel Water Capture and Reuse Pipeline</td>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$3,211,086 37.00%</td>
<td>$4,467,523</td>
<td>$8,678,609</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians Wastewater Project</td>
<td>Soboba</td>
<td>$147,905</td>
<td>$53,000 26.38%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$200,905</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycled Water Project Phase I</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$8,030,000 37.00%</td>
<td>$12,670,000</td>
<td>$21,700,000</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total $15,125,310 $40,766,143 26.78% $96,322,965 $152,214,418 65% 81%

*Green – Project on schedule or ahead of schedule*
*Yellow/Green – Delay experienced but will finish prior to Grant Completion Date*
*Yellow – Delay experienced, not on schedule, unsure if project will complete on time*
*Orange/Red – Project behind schedule, unsure if project will complete on time, or requires additional information*
Prop 84 Round 2 Project Status Update

- Plunge Creek Water Recharge and Habitat Improvement (SBVWCD)
- Recycled Water Project Phase I (Riverside Public Utilities)
- Wilson III Basins Project and Wilson Basins/Spreading Grounds (City of Yucaipa)

Proposition 84 Round 2 Amendment Request

- Enhanced Stormwater Capture / Recharge Along the Santa Ana River
  - 1A (complete)
    - Outside the Wash Plan
    - Diversion and recharge of up to 32,000 AFY and instantaneous flow of 200 cfs
Proposition 84 Round 2 Amendment Request

- Enhanced Stormwater Capture / Recharge Along the Santa Ana River
  - 1B (request to be removed from the scope)
    - Inside the Wash Plan
      - Delayed due to federal land exchange (approved by Congress on March 12, 2019)
      - Requires NEPA
    - Construction delayed until after grant termination date
    - Will still be constructed, but not as part of the grant

October 1, 2019
Submit Amendment Request to DWR

November 2019
DWR sends comments/questions to SAWPA

December 2019
SAWPA responds to DWR’s comments

January 2020
DWR sends Amendment to SAWPA for review and signature

February 2020
DWR sends fully executed Amendment to SAWPA

March 2020
SBVMWD sends fully executed Sub-Agreement Amendment to SAWPA

February 2020
SAWPA sends Sub-Agreement Amendment to SBVMWD

January 2020
SAWPA sends executed Amendment to DWR

SAWPA sends Sub-Agreement Amendment to SBVMWD
Recommendation

• Receive and file a Proposition 84 Project Status Update