

Roundtable of Regions Summit #5¹

January 12th, 2017 - Sacramento, CA

1. Welcome and Introductions

Lynn Rodriguez, Watersheds Coalition of Ventura County and Co-Chair of the IRWM Roundtable of Regions welcomed everyone to the Summit and reviewed the intent of the Summit and the agenda. Self introductions followed. In attendance were:

In person:

Abigail Solis, Alyson Watson, Anecita Agustinez, Arthur Hinojosa, Carmel Brown, Carolyn Lott, Colin Bailey, Craig Cross, Cybelle Immitt, Devin T Theobald, Gary Lippner, Holly Alpert, Hong Lin, Jane Gray, Jenna Voss, Jennifer Lau, Jim Alves, Joanna Lessard, Joe Karkoski, Joe Yun, Kate Nicholson, Katherine Gledhill, Katie Burdick, Keith Wallace, Kristin Dobbin, Loisa Burton, Lynn Rodriguez, Maria Herrera, Marilyn Thoms, Mark R. Norton PE, Mark Stadler, Masha Westropp, Matt Frary, Matthew Howard, Mike Antos, Monica Gurmilan, Nahal Ghoghaie, Phyllis Brunner, Rachel Ballanti, Sally Johnson, Sean Maguire, Sherri Norris, Ted Daum, Tim Carson, Uma Hinman, Vickie Newlin, Virginia Maloles-Fowler, Zaffar Eusuff

On phone:

Bobby Kamansky, Denise England, Eric Osterling, Greg Jaquez, Lauren Everett, Leighanne Kirk, Maija Madec, Meredith Clement, Soua Lee, Susan Robinson

2. IRWM Survey Results with Lynn Rodriguez and Holly Alpert

General Notes:

Lynn Rodriguez and Holly Alpert took the lead developing the IRWM Successes survey and synthesizing the results. The purpose of the survey was to obtain feedback from IRWM Regions regarding how the value of IRWM and how it has helped them reach their goals and address local water resource management challenges. Lynn and Holly reviewed the survey results with the group. Survey statistics: 22 regions responded to the survey representing 80.3% of the population covered by IRWM Regions. Most regions (68%) have use MOUs as their primary form of governance. 43% of regions responding have a secure source of funding over the next 2-3 years, while 29% reported they do not have secure funding. The remaining regions were unsure about their financial stability as IRWM regions. 93% of regions responding believe that IRWM has been a worthwhile investment of their time and resources.

The primary benefits reported by survey participants were – reduced water-related conflicts; improved water supply reliability and enhanced environmental resources; cost effective and integrated planning and implementation of multi-benefit projects; improved relationships, trust and collaboration among stakeholders; and DAC areas receiving much needed funds for drinking water enhancement and other

¹ Notes recorded and prepared by Kate Nicholson, Monica Gurmilan, and Nahal Ghoghaie of The Environmental Justice Coalition for Water (EJCW). Final edits by Lynn Rodriguez, Tracy Hemmeter, and Colin Bailey.

benefits.

Key findings of the survey:

- IRWM as strategy and as a grant program works and should be continued to increase regional water reliability
- Only 43% of the Regions responding have secure funding to for their IRWM program for next 2-3 years
- Rural and/or disadvantaged areas in particular need ongoing financial and technical support from the state in order to continue to be viable
- IRWM should play an important role in SGMA and as a tool in managing droughts and the effects of climate change

Key Recommendations from the survey:

- Baseline funding should be allocated by the state to IRWM Regions to sustain ongoing efforts
- DWR should release the full findings and recommendations in the Draft 2015 IRWM Strategic Plan
- DWR should continue to support IRWM through technical assistance to regions
- DWR and the SWRCB should strongly encourage SGMA efforts to include IRWM as an integral component
- State agencies should work together to address long-term funding support for integrated regional water management

The Roundtable also requests a summary of all the IRWM Implementation Grant funded projects and IRWM Planning Grant studies- and their quantified benefits - beginning with Prop. 50 and including Prop. 84. This will allow us all to better understand the tangible results of this program.

Audience Questions (Q), Answers (A), and Comments (C):

Q: Is this a grant program that will go away when there isn't a bond, or is this something that we can sustain?

C: This is an opportunity for these partnerships to help launch SGMA in a sustainable direction. Hopefully when DWR looks at SGMA funding, they might look at IRWMs as grant administrators.

C: IRWMP was a program, but IRWM is a philosophy. We need to distinguish between the two, and focus on integration between all water sector work to talk about how this program is creating the foundation of the philosophy of water management. It's an initiative to turn us towards a more integrative approach across the state.

C: We're in an evolutionary process; taking steps to move beyond just a grant program, but moving towards integration to develop multi-beneficial, multi-jurisdictional efforts for greater benefit. Need to

be careful with the fact that it's a grant program, because that leads to people throwing together their pre-existing plans and presenting them as integration. Just getting the grant money to fund projects will lead to it falling apart. Need to find a sustainable, integrated way to implement system-wide projects.

C: In regions where SGMA applies it causes even more collaboration, because it requires folks to participate who weren't involved in IRWM. In IRWM regions that aren't subject to SGMA, the districts might be too small and have limited capacity, where small agencies are funding IRWM process out of their own accounts, so to them it needs to be more than just a philosophy, but they need to see those results in projects on the ground.

C: IRWM really means bringing people together. Results might be more qualitative, but we all realize the in-person contact is motivating us to continue sharing the value of coming together.

C: From EJCW's perspective IRWM isn't just a grant program, it's a community building and resilience program. Water can attract economic growth, job opportunities, and other opportunities that provide hope for communities who have been subject to enviro-racial discrimination. We must wonder whether the Disadvantaged Community Involvement program is to be the mechanism for integration of IRWM, like the "school bussing" program that sought to end the "separate but equal" doctrine in schools. It is not necessarily a wholly favorable comparison, as school integration has been undermined for a failure to address the root causes of the racial and class inequities.

2. The Future of IRWM and Relationship with Other Programs w/ Arthur Hinojosa of DWR

General Notes:

Arthur came from background in flood management and emergency response. Now working on Drought response. IRWM works if we all work together. No single CA government entity can meet all water-related objectives. References previous job working with snow surveyors who assemble and collect info that's part of a greater cooperative of agencies and districts collecting data at the same time. Forecast their best guess of runoff in those basins. Small groups measuring entire watersheds (only 5 people for Sierra Nevada Watershed).

Upcoming Strategic Plan Notes:

- Challenge we're trying to address was understanding the context of what it is that's changing what DWR does on regional basis.
- One document will have recommendations from Stakeholders, while other document is DWR's plan of how they'll see it all through as a department. Still not ready to share, because they have to check in with more people (executives at the natural resource agency) to review it and approve.
- Just put forth an Accomplishments for CA's Water Action Plan – on website.
- Document will outline strategies, actions, and intended outcomes in going forward with regional sustainability.
 - A lot of communities are struggling with permits, and financing for floods, etc.

Regulatory history not conducive to forward progress:

- Difficult to articulate challenge of where we are and how we got here as a state. "The problem was ourselves (as a society)." Principle driver for development has been economic prosperity,

protecting investments and maybe lives (avoiding costs in providing public safety).

- Realized growth was impacting our lives and environment, then we started curbing economic growth for the sake of other sensitivities.
- Regulations are built to “say no” and restrict, not make what we want to do easier; they’re not built to work with forward thinking. How can we continue to make progress in sustainability if the very constructs are built to prevent it?

Evolution to a watershed-based approach to water management:

- There are 2,000 agencies in CA only for managing water. Most of our problems follow water boundaries, so we’re promoting evolution to a watershed-driven approach to water management.
- SGMA gives us an opportunity to take the step towards this kind of governance structure. With SGMA comes authority that IRWM doesn’t have. GSAs have the ability to assess their constituents. Not sustainable to continue to borrow money for these projects in the form of grant funding.
- This might require taxes. This is where state will serve as the enforcer. How do we do that equitably? What plan alludes to is a river basin scale governance structure that grows with autonomy as the plans mature to the satisfaction to set of criteria we develop, the state turns money back to regions per their plans, and will take a little off the top to collect data and redistribute to communities who don’t have the adequate tax base to fund this project.
- Asked communities what they value:
 - Economy, public safety, ecosystems, and enriching experiences (recreation, spiritual use, simply knowing there’s a river nearby).
 - If every region can ascertain the balance of these values and create a plan that can realize sustainability and balance these values in perpetuity, then why should the state have anything to say about it. They’ll trust the region to have it taken care of – that’s the hope, which will be developed over time.

Audience Questions, Answers, and Comments:

Q: “Reasonable” public health and safety?

A: Flood control is the reason they say “reasonable.” They could build the ultimate levee, but have to consider what we can invest in it and what exactly it’s protecting. Drinking water should be more absolute, to meet the safety threshold without compromise. Also should look at access (reasonable, or absolute?)

Q: What are the goals for “Stable Economy” and how to rationalize that with other goals?

A: A stable economy is more important to DWR. Growth might be the target, but it’s not necessarily sustainable. More suitable for the water resources agency. Seems counter to what most water purveyors are striving for, so it’s not necessarily an accurate goal, while it is ideal.

C: Cultural Stressors – in a growing economy what does that mean in the water management perspective. TEK should be a point of conversation as well.

Q: How would the state oversee the collection of these regional efforts and address cross-watershed overlap?

A: Many challenges with regards to boundaries and borders. River basin scale was chosen as water management issues align well within these regions.

Q: Alluded to a vetting process, what should we anticipate in terms of input we can provide in the final document?

A: Will start with the focus group who developed strategic plan in the first place, as primary purpose is giving themselves direction.

A: Hoping to have a draft to share with Roundtable group before moving forward. Hosting an April summit in relationship to all water management issues they hope to address.

A: Survey happening now that's part of California Water Plan update. Survey out now that relates to 4 societal goals. Need to define these as a state to decide on statewide distribution of resources, etc. Sending it out as a survey monkey, and has a few support documents to review before completing survey.

Q: Setting societal values in our culture involves a time-intensive process. Do we have the players present you can help coordinate this process, as state agencies aren't equipped to do this?

A: SGMA just put out best management practices advisory docs. In coming months we'll see continued GSA formation and submitting GS plans. Hope it'll leverage the work that's already occurred through the IRWM process. Have to get out to everyone to learn what the undesirable outcomes are. If they're smart, they won't try to reinvent the wheel. DWR will advocate for it, but won't force them to consult IRWMs. Will impact land use decisions, so if they're smart they'll talk to everyone in their area to achieve their goals on furthering groundwater management.

A: Important that state make it clear to forming GSA's, even if they're not connected to IRWM yet, it should be articulated in guidance docs that DWR is producing. Docs should say they should work with IRWM region as part of their stakeholder engagement process. Takes away the strength of our activity.



Q: What will watershed based governance structure look like? Governance has been a major barrier when working with DACs. What can DWR do to create a more inclusive structure?

C: "Reasonable" public health and safety – there's an element of necessary health and safety, that makes sure that water that's delivered to our communities meets adequate safety guidelines. Should change this section to "necessary," because this would allow certain parts of the state to not be held to ensuring the Human Right to Water.

3. IRWM Grant Program Update w/Zaffar Eusuff, Keith Wallace from DWR & Sean Macguire

Zaffar: Update on Proposition 1 Planning, DACI and Implementation Grants and Timeline

Planning Grant: Received 15 applications, all recommended for funding through two categories (new plan (2 apps), and 2016 standard (13 apps)) – more coming on this in the afternoon.

DAC Involvement Grant: \$51 million for DAC involvement – already started: RFP in August. Receiving proposals – more on this in afternoon as well.

Implementation Grant: \$367 mil for implementation; planning to have 2 implementation rounds.

Other Grants: Also administering many other grant categories of varying amounts (re: counties with stressed basins, for sustainable groundwater development, etc.), see handout for full details. Planning to release awards list in early March, with a public comment meetings third week of March. See handouts for full schedule of meetings and deadlines. DACI schedule – hoping to award all the funding by June for activities over next 3 years, eg. implementation between 2018-2020, and another round of funding for DACs. DWR wants our input at upcoming scoping meetings.

Audience Questions, Answers, and Comments:

C: DAC funding is a statewide competition, not by region

Q: How to fix the flaw with the program that the first 50% of grant is made in advance and then second half is from old refund process; NGOs can't wait to get reimbursed but that's how the system works; DAC projects have dropped out of the funding upon realizing that the second half of funding is reimbursement based?

A: It used to be all reimbursement based so it's moving in a positive direction by now half of it being up front.

Q: If only \$4.2 million has been requested out of \$5 million available, what will happen to the rest of the funds?

A: \$4.2 mil requested and granted, the remaining balance of \$.8 million will go back to the original Prop. 1 IRWM funding pot, to be allocated using the formula established for Funding Areas.

Keith: Advance Funding Process

For more information on SB208 authorized advance funding and DWR Process for advance payment, see handout.

Requests must be made within 90 days; we don't have a mechanism for grant approval without an executed grant agreement. Request must be a packet submitted to us including: documentation on notice given to grantee of eligible grant orgs to make sure that they know about their eligibility, and a response and they must also include a timeline and a brief description of ability to implement project after advance funds are exhausted, and an invoice for funds.

Audience Questions, Answers, and Comments:

Q: What is the purpose of the explanation of ability?

A: The purpose of explanation of ability is to demonstrate and explain that you will be able to implement the project, to show that you're still committed to completing the project; both about showing you have

the resources to complete it as well as the commitment. It's really been just a short paragraph in the applications we've received so far, it's more to show the commitment but trying to show both.

Q: Who is the Local Project Sponsor (LPS) in a DACI grant?

A: Who the LPS is in a DACI depends on the specific project, the activities are <1mil, someone has been identified as the one implementing the action.

Q: What if you can't demonstrate financial capacity when you are only getting half of the first half of funding up front and the rest is all invoiced and won't be reimbursed in a timely manner?

A: We're not expecting direct proof for all the funding that you'll be reimbursed for necessarily right up front; grantees are just responsible for following through. If you immediately start invoicing even when you're still using the initial upfront funds you will get reimbursed more quickly. You can actually do that, though it gets kind of tricky from an accounting perspective because we'll want the accounting separate.

Q: Is there some way to exert leverage on the process where we don't know where in the process of reimbursement it is, no one to contact, lack of transparency about where in the process, etc. We've had it take 90+ days to get reimbursed even after the forms have left your desk.

A: It is a quick process on our end, when there's 60 days total, we only get 10 days of that when the rest is in other parts of the process. A lot of it is out of our control. An understanding around how this impacts the stakeholders might help this be expedited.

Q: Can the advance payment and reimbursement processes happen concurrently, but separately?

A: Yes, though we really need to be able to make the distinction between the two cost types. Something says that you must spend your advance funds before starting the reimbursement process, but we're trying to work within the process. Think about who is in greatest needs of advance funds and try to delegate and prioritize accordingly.

Q: What would be DWR's ability to incorporate a variation altering the time horizon or % coming up front?

A: We're at the mercy of legislation – if there was legislation put up for that we would have to go with that.

Sean: Stormwater Resource Plans and Grants

Prop 1 IRWM chapter also had \$200mil for multi-benefit stormwater projects, we've awarded 28 planning grants for stormwater resource plans, a prerequisite for getting other projects funded. In Dec, we awarded 105mil for other projects.

We're interested in feedback for how stormwater resource plans are working for you in your regions, looking to see how stormwater resource plans will/can be incorporated into IRWM process. In the next couple of months, all the projects need to be listed into an existing stormwater resource plan and that stormwater resource plan needs to be integrated into the region's IRWM plan.

Audience Questions, Answers, and Comments:

Q: Will there be another chance to get funding for stormwater resource plans?

A: Our intention was to roll remaining funds into implementation projects after this first round of

projects, right now no plans for another round

Q: Is there any incorporation of groundwater into these stormwater resource plans? Why is there not more integration of stormwater and groundwater in IRWM?

A: Stormwater planning was perceived to be a gap in IRWM, might be some of regulations within sw. Some regions are incorporating stormwater plans into IRWMPs. SB985 will be addressed later this afternoon, look at overlap and cohesion of plans.

Q: Is the opportunity to mesh plans in the next round of funding? Could guidelines be modified to include insuring that the different (stormwater, groundwater, IRWM) plans are collaborating? Currently it doesn't require any collaboration.

A: That is great feedback, but it's still to be determined but we'll try to consider that for next time.

C: Timing in general, completing major plans over and over, and with own sets of guidelines. The changing of guidelines and specifications from one round of plans to another is really difficult and hard



to reconcile.

4. Disadvantaged Community Involvement Program (DACIP) with Joe Yun and Craig Cross of DWR, moderated by Colin Bailey of EJCW

Topics Include: DACIP grant awards, advance payments, role of DWR, model of ongoing regional roundtables for Prop 1 Technical Assistance (TA), best practices on DAC and IRWM identity

General Notes:

It's been 15 years of work to put money towards DACs, but those benefits weren't being realized in terms of lasting capacity, etc. There are 3 objectives for DACI: 1. Work to involve DAC Stakeholders as part of planning process. 2. Increase understanding of area-wide needs. 3. Position DACs and future IRWMs to take advantage of future funding opportunities.

Of 12 funding areas, DWR has 3 proposals, and only one has been awarded. Not as far along as they imagined they'd be by now. While that's okay, there are consequences in timing, and the amount of

work that has to happen and how that positions us for implementation rounds.

DACI participants should take the opportunity to participate in IRWM Implementation scoping meetings to give insight on how implementation scheduling specifically the DACI project funding might work from DACI project perspective. DWR is available to come to the individual funding areas to start more open communication and see how we can move DACI proposals forward. In general, lessons learned from the proposals we have reviewed includes paying attention to the supporting information for process and actions and putting background information to provide logic support for proposed actions. While it is OK to wait for DWR feedback on proposals, it does burn time. If you haven't submitted a proposal yet, DWR can come out to help provide real time feedback as your proposal is being assembled. We want to get our project proposals executed as soon as possible. Perhaps instating quarterly gatherings for people to come together for cross-pollination would be helpful.

Audience Questions, Answers, and Comments:

Q: Staffing question: The DWR grant staff working on this don't have many regions to work with. Is staffing ready for quick turn around?

A: When DWR envisioned what it would take, they prepared their staff to support this project. Feel well-resourced to help folks.

Q: Will grant agreement requirements be generally the same as Prop 84?

A: The DACI template is located on our website:

http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/grants/resources_contracttemp.cfm. Many provisions are similar to other program agreements. There are some specific revisions made for DACI.

Q: There is much discussion about interrelationship between DACI and Prop 1 TA Program at State Board, can you offer reflections on to what degree TA Program is well known and how's it embraced in terms of work plans?

DWR is working with State Board Staff as we review proposals. Our coordination is looking not only for potential overlap, but also looking for potential opportunities so applicants can get the most out of the two programs. Generally, we don't assume that an applicant has high awareness of how DACI and SWB TA may be complimentary so our internal coordination and communication to the applicant is important.. Could use education on that. The project design is that as they do engagement with communities, they'll decide if it'll qualify for TA program, or if DACI is correct place for it. Will send out a list of communities that SWB is already working with in their TA program and circulate it to the Roundtable listserv as well. To recap - if while reviewing DACI proposals DWR comes across an activity that is more related to development of a "capital project" DWR would share the proposal with Meghan to determine fit for the SWB's TA funding.

Q: North Coast Tribes asked that TA contractors should be on the list of providers. How can we build on that list?

A: Contact Meghan Tosney (Meghan.Tosney@waterboards.ca.gov) at the State Water Board to discuss.

Q: Leveraging convener role of DWR and Roundtable, what is your thinking of what DWR could offer to the collective goal of a statewide IRWM program, with DAC program leading the way?

A: When DWR talks about convening or distributing information, it's a broad stroke. There are pieces

there that would happen with conversation. The vision isn't expanded beyond the DACI program and how they work with IRWMs. The state doesn't want to have the role of telling folks what to do and what not to do, but encouraging cross-pollination is something they can do.

C: Megan is working on sharing best practices and determining best solutions going forward through SWB. DWR could possibly piggy back, if it's not too different of a conversation.

Q: Are people interested in an info sharing plan?

A: Many are already doing it. Some DAC projects put together a roundtable that met 3-4 times, then met at a summit. It was helpful to sit together to learn about project status and what are some difficulties. All seem to be supportive of getting together in a formal way to discuss among 12 funding areas.

C: There's value to logistics collaborative, but if DWR is aiming to achieve change it would be helpful to know, because this will help guide our conversations and work in that direction.

A: Yes. DWR is looking for things to help evolve the program.

Q: As an informal poll, how many of the funding areas are distributing their DACI funds on an IRWM-by-IRWM region basis vs area wide? How many funding areas are funding based on need vs regional population numbers? It sounds like several are doing the later.

C: Funding is funding area wide, but eventually there will be equity on project development dollars, where funding will start being channeled based on need.

C: Funding regions don't have relationship to watersheds, which doesn't help you learn about what's going on in your watershed. If the ultimate goal is to work within our watersheds (SGMA), then we should start moving discussion and understanding in that direction.

A: DWR: Start from where we are, then start deciding how we can build hydrologic region context into our work. Build on these as things evolve.

C: When crafting Prop 1 TA Program, it was intended to be broad in application through a drafting oversight. Determined TA program had to have a nexus with a capital improvement program. Went from a grand programmatic approach to an ad hoc program and some emphasis on broader scope things shifted to the DACI program, including needs assessment (secondary data).

Q: Ideal to have statewide repository to demonstrate where those regions of need are. Many agencies and groups are working on that. What progress have you made in that respect?

A: DWR has previously discussed sharing information gathered in the DACI program.

Q: Does DWR think that the DACI needs assessment will have a home that's available, accessible, and useful (GIS layers, data, etc.)?

A:

DWR is willing to make data from the DACI program available.

Q: Has DWR given thought to how they'll evaluate successfully meeting programmatic objectives of DACI?

A: Metric was initially, can we position IRWM, in relation to DACs, to take advantage of implementation opportunities. This will change the IRWM in a variety of ways, but this is something we'll determine over time.

A: DAC projects aren't developed enough to be competitive for implementation funding. DACI program is to help them upgrade their projects and get them involved in the planning process. DACI will help expand on this engagement process. It's a hard metric to measure, but that's an ultimate goal.

Q: Has to be a capacity building effort so that when money's gone, we don't see we just paid for some projects. Does DWR team have a role in pulling us all in that direction?

A: When we talk about DAC Implementation projects, we need to talk about how by doing the work of DACI, we're building capacity in the regions to be ready to start applying for all the various sources of funding.

C: Small Water Systems Assistance Program, where Mojave program helps DACs with grant readiness: bylaws, getting code correct, simple things to make sure they're ready to apply for tech assistance. Anything to get them into a position to receive outside funding. Takes several years to get these systems on board as they tend to be apprehensive.

C: Many ways to measure DAC Involvement and success of engaging previously overlooked populations. Prop 1 does require DWR to measure the success of the stakeholders and their own. Kristin Dobbins is co-author of Community Engagement document in the case of SGMA. See: https://d3n8a8pro7vhm.cloudfront.net/communitywatercenter/pages/52/attachments/original/1438102537/SGMA_Stakeholder_Engagement_White_Paper.pdf?1438102537.

C: If a need is articulated as an IRWM/DWR need, but then is sent to Megan at SWB, there might not be adequate infrastructure ready there that will balance out technical and planning needs for DACs specifically, so needs to be more of an effort on how we can cross-pollinate information between DWR and SWB Prop 1 funding programs.

C: As the needs assessment moves forward and more applications come in, Megan is looking to have more collaboration. Scopes and work plans will be tailored to specific communities and more collaboration and feedback will help in that.

C: There are so many water companies in many areas, 1/3 of them are probably serving DACs but there's so little capacity for them and information, support in general for so many smaller systems. It's a systemic, statewide issue, and in LA/Ventura will focus on that in its IRWMP. Challenges have included that it's hard for people to see that this program is about people. It looks like its project based and many people still have it in their head that it's all about infrastructure, but this is about people and we don't solely want to base this on what projects end up from that, but maybe need another metric to quantify/discuss/share/record successes with this people/outreach-based work, especially in this group that has traditionally done projects.

C: State Board projects are more capital projects, a lot of money available for project development will be used as model projects to serve as templates for other regions in dealing with DACs. We're not trying to use these funds for things that could be funded by the state board. We're hoping that funding will go to things that need it, human elements, not the things that could be funded by the state water board.

C: We want to use the needs assessments as a starting point for working with the actual communities,

so that they're the ones deciding what they want to work on, etc. We also want to educate on what is IRWM and think beyond the traditional need for a new well, water meters, etc. and work more in an integrated fashion and with other regions with relationship-building.

C: On Colin's call for "deep democracy", we should be wary of the instinct of trying to foresee our outcomes and forming our projects to hit them. We're doing something totally new, we don't want to predict everything and end up at a predicted place when it could end up somewhere new and better that we don't know. These projects will hopefully add a lot of social capital to our communities and help them be more resilient; we should enter the more social science side of things even though it's harder to quantify but when coming back to the more technical side we'll have gained a lot.

C: We have a scale challenge. Don't just do a needs assessment, do a strengths and needs assessment. Both address needs and build on strengths.

C: Stakeholders will talk to city council, etc., word will get around eventually if there's something good happening, communities will talk about it. However, not every DAC will want to talk to you or work with you because you're the State.

C: Feedback from communities has been not wanting to come to meetings in order to participate, or travel, or make it inconvenient for them at all. Many projects have ended up wasting grant money with over-engineering where projects are too big and the community doesn't have the operations and maintenance capacity so it has to be reengineered, wasting time and money – predatory over-engineering. Idea of having team of ethical engineers that could travel to smaller communities and specifically not over-engineer and be trained on smaller water systems – perhaps having some sort of certification or stamp of approval.

C: Grant money is going to on-the-ground NGOs but the vision for the grant is that a lot of it is going to the NGOs who are building the capacity and making the connections.

C: We've been trying to create a space for communities when hiring a consultant or engineer, so that everyone can have a say on it. Tulare's experience has included incorporating community input, but has also struggled with lack of trust because there's only a single applicant for the grant which makes communities nervous.

C: The Greater LA DAC committee has made a list of as-needed DAC consultants, but there's been issues with conflict of interest. We've been trying to have a community-based think-tank to create materials, offer input to steering committee, etc.

Next steps: EJCW to work with Roundtable of Regions and DWR to convene those who expressed interest in follow-on conversation on statewide needs assessment, performance metrics and evaluation, etc.

*** BREAK ***

DAC Involvement Grant Administrators Discussion

General Discussion on Coordinating and Sharing (DWR was not present for this discussion):

C: Inconsistencies to watch for:

- Templates and forms
- Reimbursement formulas (draw-down vs. other; difficult for project using project partners)
- Differences in management styles of DWR liaisons, differences between offices
- Policies on moving money between tasks and needing amendments

Note from DWR: DACI grant administrators should feel free to point out such inconsistencies directly to the DWR Program Manager. While there may be good reason for differences in how different funding programs are administered, DWR wants to reduce the variations a grantee may experience on the same funding program. Quarterly gatherings may be another venue to discuss such variations.

C: Many administrators have administered/are administering Prop 84 grants.

Q: Needs assessment feedback

A: 1 needs assessment with all elements that address differences between 3 regions, and if that part doesn't apply to you, you just don't fill it out. There are many forms that you can aggregate for a larger form. We don't want to all have to start from scratch every time when we could all share which would be easier in the long run anyway.

C: It would be nice to have performance metrics come back from contractors.

C: Invoice form with progress report, stipulated timesheet invoice contract. If level of detail on forms isn't sufficient we don't approve invoices. Smartsheets could help that and make it simpler. Incorporating differential invoice frequencies, with more frequent (monthly) invoices for smaller entities and quarterly, etc. for larger entities/orgs.

C: Sharing tracking spreadsheets for direct funds and reimbursements are great, especially you're doing both concurrently.

Q: Grant administration cost is a big issue in San Diego region, trying to make grantor costs being reimbursed, now adding more people because we have 50+ projects – How are you reallocating costs if the grant runs out in the period? How are you funding grant administrators?

A: We don't track costs specific to project, take some grant funds for grant admin funding

A: Under implementation grant, utilized an up-front grant contingency fee, where each agency (though not DACs) made an up-front proportional fee that would be refunded if left over, helped avoid running out of grant funds

A: In submission we have 19-20 tasks within 3 elements, we budgeted out for the broader tasks but DWR wants to see the specific internal task budget but only makes you sign agreement for the broader tasks. Ask for that agreement from DWR in writing.

A: Place insurance on project/task based on amount of project and scope of work, for us as the grantee,

ask the subcontractors

Q: Do grantees plan to put together a manual?

A: Some regions have.

Q: How have groups dealt with overhead costs and whether or not to include salary calculations?

A: Consistency as far as that would be very beneficial. Katie was audited but wasn't questioned on overhead as contractors.

A: Have a unified methodology on how to calculate budget, calculate salary, levels of detail, especially in budget justification, especially when dealing with really small groups who don't have capacity as subcontractors

A: Fed Gov only has 3 ways of budget calculation? Each group can choose the one that works best for them. USEPA has a package, can use last fiscal year's accounting to plug in info.

Q: Issues on lack of transparency in developing proposals (between regions within funding area?)?

A: Some build websites to form central repository, hold meetings

Next steps: EJCW to work with Roundtable of Regions and DWR to convene grant administrators for follow-on conversation to continue identifying and sharing best practices and helpful tools and advice.

5. Baseline Funding Roundtable Discussion by Mark Stadler with Katie B, Mike A, Holly A

A draft report was sent out, formerly known as the strategic plan and had lots of good recommendations.

Q: Identify baseline funding for IRWM regions to support key operations annually as soon as possible. To IRWMs that satisfy basic performance standards and what would rules be about using the funding?

A: Funding could be used for day to day governance activities, for research and monitoring needs. Other activities that wouldn't otherwise be funding to help fully inform an IRWM plan in the future.

A: (Katie) The Legislators have no insight into understanding or appreciation of IRWM. A few who she's talked to perceive it as a vehicle for getting grant money. The nexus of projects deciding who can go forward for funding isn't understood by legislators. Unsure about concrete solution.

A: Some regions have a pay to play system, which isn't going to work in DACI Program, since they can't apply unless they already put money forward. Until legislature is able to understand the value, they won't support it.

C: Survey was intended to provide the information for developing a baseline funding mechanism. So that all audiences could be aware of the value of IRWM programs.

C: CalFed and Dept. of Conservation used to have watershed coordinators. Placed people across the state to give people a contact to facilitate partnerships and inter/intra-watershed coordination.

C: SAWPA has a program that will determine whether each IRWM is structured to do actual integrated, multi-regional approach, then they could qualify for funding.

C: Concern it might be incentive to break up funding areas. The process is so intensive that it's probably not likely.

C: Expenditures necessary to put meetings together and engaging partners and creating watershed

alliances, including 3 Bond Proposals, mostly framed as parks and water bond. 2 of the 3 have chunks of money that can go towards IRWM. There are places to provide input with the authors. Might be for implementation. Once the white paper is finalized would be the companion to the survey results. Has good suggestions for IRWMs working with EJ Community.

6. IRWM Plan Updates or Amendments with Ted Daum and Joe Yun

Prop1 Requires DWR to have another process for IRWM plans. It won't be as detailed of a process as it was before. For the plans that passed the last process, the 2016 IRWM guideline requirements will already have been addressed in the earlier process. AB 1249 regarding water quality standards will have to be dealt with under new plan and process. Stormwater regional plans and equivalent will have to be addressed. We're working with stormwater folks at the water board to coordinate so there's not redundancy in requirements. There are 20 year GHG reduction projects – there will be a ranking of resources regarding climate change scenarios and rainfall and runoff requirements that will have to be addressed. The plan has to be 2016 Guideline compliant in order to apply for implementation funding. The guideline requirements spreadsheet has been modified and is accessible on DWR's website. There's also a scoresheet online that has 16 particular guideline requirements, and if a project meets all 16 of 16, then it qualifies. 70% applies to specific requirements.

7. Wrap up and Future Actions

Follow-up Committees and Volunteers (to be called together, initially, by EJCW):

- Data/ Needs assessment: Colin, Joanna, Mike A., Catherine Gledhill, Sherri, Matt, Lynn, Jane, Virginia
- Evaluation: Kristin, Maria, Mike, Marilyn, Colin, Matt, Catherine, Sherri