

**JOINT SPECIAL MEETING OWOW STEERING COMMITTEE/NEWPORT BAY
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes**

Date and Location: April 16, 2009 – 10:05 a.m. – 11:36 a.m.
Green River Golf Course
5215 Green River Road
Corona, CA 91720

Participants: **NEWPORT BAY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**
John Moorlach, County of Orange Board of Supervisors
Fred Ameri, Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board
Wally Kreutzen, City of Irvine
Dean Kirk, The Irvine Company
Nancy Gardner, City of Newport Beach
Deborah Gavello, City of Tustin
Kathryn McCullough, City of Lake Forest
Peer Swan, Irvine Ranch Water District
OWOW STEERING COMMITTEE
Marion Ashley, Riverside County Board of Supervisors
Beth Krom, City of Irvine
Garry Brown, Orange County Coastkeeper

Committee Staff: Ms. Mary Anne Skorpanich, County of Orange
Kari Schumaker, County of Orange
Betty Martinez, County of Orange

SAWPA Staff: Celeste Cantu
Ron Sullivan
Wyatt Troxel
Jeff Beehler
Patti Bonawitz

Attendees: Rick Francis, Deputy Chief of Staff to Supervisor Moorlach
Paul Jones, Irvine Ranch Water District
Mike Loving, City of Irvine
Roger Mallet, Newport Bay Naturalists and Friends
Mark Tettermer, Irvine Ranch Water District
Alex Waite, City of Tustin
Bob Woodings, City of Lake Forest
Marsha Westropp, Orange County Water District
Jack Keating, Newport Bay Naturalists and Friends
Doug Stack, City of Tustin
Dave Kiff, City of Newport Beach

Agenda Item 1 – Introductions

The meeting was called to order by the Executive Committee Chair, Supervisor John Moorlach at 10:05 a.m. Supervisor Moorlach introduced himself and requested that each Executive Committee and Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority (SAWPA) One Water One Watershed (OWOW) Steering Committee member introduce themselves.

Agenda Item 2 – Public Comments

Mr. Keating said that he wished for a successful meeting and that an agreement would be made.

Agenda Item 3 – History and Mission

Supervisor Moorlach gave a brief history of the Executive Committee, which has been working for 25 years on watershed management for the Central Orange County WMA. He mentioned that there has been some struggle with deciding whether or not to join with OWOW for current Integrated Regional Water Management efforts. He informed everyone that the Executive Committee had held a meeting one week prior to this meeting and that a vote was taken with a narrow majority favoring working together with OWOW. He expressed that he was excited about potential collaboration with OWOW and that he hoped that there would be further collaboration at this meeting and that he was looking forward to discussing some of the discrepancies with the governance document.

Mrs. Cantu shared that SAWPA recently celebrated its 40th anniversary and explained SAWPA's three main functions:

1. To manage a utility, the Santa Ana Regional Interceptor (SARI) Line; this consists of draining salt from upper watersheds and capturing salt before being released to the lower watershed and thereby protect water quality in the lower watershed.
2. Collaborate via round table; 10 – 20 different groups meet to solve complicated water problems that usually involve two or more different water entities.
3. High level watershed planning; OWOW is in its fourth or fifth iteration of integrated regional water efforts. It is more expansive and wishes to include everyone; agencies, entities and individuals.

Mrs. Cantu also mentioned that the SAWPA Commission is composed of five major water wholesalers:

- Eastern Municipal Water District
- Western Municipal Water District
- Inland Empire Utilities Agency
- San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District
- Orange County Water District

Mr. Swan added that the newly adopted OWOW model is similar to what the Newport Bay Executive Committee has been doing for twenty-five years. He noted that working together with different entities to collectively solve problems is a method that has been very successful for the Executive Committee and he applauded OWOW for this.

Mr. Sullivan expressed his excitement and thanked Supervisor Moorlach and Supervisor Campbell for their efforts in Orange County and said that he looked forward to working together. Ms. Krom stated that our region will be given recognition and will be considered stronger if we work together without focusing on jurisdictional boundaries. This process has required trust from all engaged parties and she hoped for a positive outcome from the meeting.

Agenda Item – 4- OWOW Governance Structure

Ms. Cantu said that even after the governance document has been established changes will occur and that the water issues in the Santa Ana River Region will continue to change. She recommended embracing all of the improvements to the OWOW governance document that the Executive Committee requested, except for some points that warrant further deliberation. One of these points is the reduction of the OWOW Steering Committee members from ten to nine. Ms. Cantu feels that nine members would be too few and she suggested adding more members rather than subtracting members, if an odd number is important. She mentioned that there would be several possible entities to select from such as the Environmental Justice Community, the public at large, the Regional Water Board, or other groups if an 11th member is desired. These were just some suggestions and will be the subject of future deliberations.

Another point that Ms. Cantu said would need further discussion was the OWOW Pillar structure. Internal governance within the Pillars had been established by each Pillar individually, they were allowed to create their own culture, and this method seems to have worked. Initially they envisioned two year memberships, however, that would seem to be too restrictive. SAWPA staff are pleased when the Pillar members simply continue to attend the meetings. Fortunately all participants have demonstrated a great amount of consistency, participation and leadership.

Ms. Skorpanich initiated discussion of a letter from SAWPA staff outlining their reactions to the Executive Committee's proposed OWOW governance structure changes. She clarified that the Executive Committee met on April 8, 2009 and developed suggestions for changes to the OWOW governance document. This response from SAWPA staff is based on their review of these requested changes proposed by the Executive Committee.

Ms. Krom mentioned that it appeared that for the most part the changes are acceptable except for the 9 versus 11 members of the OWOW Steering Committee.

Supervisor Moorlach concurred that the issue was 9 versus 11 members on the OWOW Steering Committee and perhaps also the naming, that Santa Ana Watershed Region might be more amenable than the Santa Ana River Region because everything we do at the State has a watershed focus.

Mr. Swan mentioned that he has concerns about project selection and asked if it would be acceptable to have a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). He suggested that a technical staff person could be the 11th member for the OWOW Steering Committee.

Ms. Cantu countered this idea by stating that the Pillars already act like a TAC and that she could not see asking a technical staff person to be a voting member of the Steering Committee. There is

a difference between technical staff and elected officials who are accustomed to making policy decisions. Therefore, Steering Committee members should continue to be sought at the level of elected officials.

Supervisor Moorlach commented that this was a step of faith for us to collaborate and trust that everything will work out; he said that the Central Orange County WMA wants to end up all better and no worse through this process.

Mr. Brown stated that a resolution is close. He noted that the IRWM Plan is a living document and said that the process will change, however, so far, the work has been constructive. As far as whether there are 9 or 11 members on the OWOW Steering Committee that can be determined later. He is not ready to abandon the Pillar concept and felt that it brought many people into the process and that they needed to be kept engaged until this really gets running.

Mr. Troxel added that the Pillars are workgroups that flush out the facts and characterize the issues. He stated that bringing issues up helps characterize the nature of what the projects should be. The greater purpose of OWOW should be to utilize the broader skill sets that the Pillars represent. Integration cannot occur without communication first. The outcomes of the Pillars are to present issues and facts as we see them. He recognized that OWOW will not solve everyone's problems but commented that it will solve the most critical issues. He enthused that this idea would then be repeated throughout California, the West, and the United States.

Mr. Swan explained that he would be more comfortable if specific goals were set and he suggested that a TAC could integrate Pillar work to see how goals were being met with funding. Mr. Troxel responded that the Pillar leaders fill this role and that each Pillar came up with objectives and changed those objectives based on feedback. The role of Pillar leaders is collaboration. He mentioned that the current structure is that each of the Pillars has an existing collaboration and handles different issues and have their individual objectives. These objectives were then shared, ranked and reset. Specific targets and long term goals have not been set because the focus has been on the short term goals and there has been a sliding time frame from the State for the application process.

Ms. Gardner said it is important to have goals and objectives outlined because sometimes, despite meeting specific criteria, projects can still have detrimental results. Ms. Krom asked if a draft could be distributed because this appears to be an outstanding issue, however, she commented that all other issues appeared to have resolutions.

Mr. Sullivan assured everyone that this has never been a closed process and that everyone will have a say on the final product. He acknowledged that developing goals is valuable, that criteria for project ranking is critical, and that it does come down to trust. This is an open process and it will continue that way.

Mr. Troxel stated that OWOW envisioned the ten Steering Committee members making the first prioritization. They wanted a matrix that would rank, but not to make a final decision on the outcome of projects; it should be flexible enough to accommodate changes and policy decisions. He stated that the OWOW prioritization model was still being perfected and that it is a complicated process. The outcome of prioritization must make sense.

Ms. Skorpanich stated that she was hearing two types of issues: (1) the structure of the OWOW Steering Committee; and (2) the content of the IRWMP and what will be incorporated into that plan. She suggested that the group focus on the structural issues first and then discuss content separately.

Mr. Swan noted that he likes quantifiable goals and stated that before we go into this we should have certain targets for which we aim. Ms. Cantu said that OWOW will develop quantifiable goals before putting out a call for projects.

At this point, Ms. Gavello inquired about including a mission statement for the governance document or a bulleted list of what we want to accomplish, e.g. goals or values. She requested that the concept of “all better, no worse” be expressed somewhere in the governance. It was explained that the goals and values for the IRWM Plan would be separate from any goals and values for the governance document. Ms. Krom suggested that having some language to look at would be helpful and noted that “all better, no worse” may not always be possible, but that the group would not undertake any project that would cause harm outright.

Mr. Ashley suggested that perhaps a smaller group should be formed to refine the governance structure document. Mr. Brown stated that he would be happy to participate. Discussion ensued regarding modeling the Steering Committee like a Planning Commission, and that it was not essential to have a technical person sit on the Steering Committee. It was the consensus of all members present to see how far we could go to find commonality and if that couldn't be found, then discussions could continue. However, most all felt that both committees were not that far apart.

Ms. Mary Anne Skorpanich noted that there was one business item for the Newport Bay Executive Committee, since they did have a quorum present. At their last meeting, Orange County staff had been given direction to file an RAP application with the Department of Water Resources by April 29th, requesting recognition of the Central Orange County WMA as a region for Proposition 84, Chapter 2 funding. She requested direction as to whether or not to proceed with that application. They unanimously agreed to not file a separate application and to join with OWOW for this current RAP cycle.

Agenda Item – 6- Adjournment

Supervisor Moorlach stated that the Central Orange County WMA would have faith and trust SAWPA with this process and that the two groups would pursue excellence together. He thanked the OWOW Steering Committee for joining the Executive Committee today.

With no further business before the Committees, Mr. Sullivan and Supervisor Moorlach jointly adjourned the meeting at 11:36 a.m.