



Disadvantaged Communities Visioning Workshop December 3-5, 2014

**Recommendations
January 31, 2015**

Preamble

Proposition 50 and Proposition 84, and the corresponding creation of Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) planning groups, significantly altered California’s approach to water management. As these programs evolved, a growing gap emerged between the activities of the traditional water community and the needs of disadvantaged communities and the people that live and work there. In response to these concerns, the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) initiated seven IRWM disadvantaged community grant projects, representing a diverse socio-economic landscape, to identify more effective means of engaging with and responding to the water-related needs of disadvantaged communities.

This document presents recommendations formed during more than three years of grant project work. These projects culminated in a three-day workshop convened in December 2014 that included representatives of the DWR and the State Water Resources Control Board. The recommendations distilled from the workshop cover the following topics: Disadvantaged Community Identification, Coordination, Agency Alignment, Capacity Building and Technical Assistance, Education, Disproportionate Impacts, Governance and Representation, and Funding. These recommendations are inter-related and ultimately present a vision for a more effective, equitable and accessible roadmap to meeting the water needs of disadvantaged communities. While each can be treated as a “stand-alone” recommendation, the document is organized in a way that recommendations build on each other (e.g. “Funding” describes needs for all previous recommendations). Throughout this document, the term “disadvantaged communities” includes “chosen/trusted representatives of communities”.

What follows is a roadmap for each set of recommendations, including a vision for the change we seek, a description of the current barriers to this change, and associated objectives and recommendations to implement our vision. The proposed recommendations align with key state-level documents directing water resources planning and management in California. These documents include the 2013 California Water Plan Update, the 2014 State Water Action Plan, and Californians without Safe Water and Sanitation report. These recommendations are forwarded with the aspiration that they advance solutions to meet the water-related needs of California's disadvantaged communities.

Planning Committee for the 2014 Disadvantaged Communities Visioning Workshop comprised of the following individuals.

Mark Drew
California Trout/Inyo-Mono IRWM Program
(mdrew@caltrout.org)

Carolina Balazs
UC Davis
(cbalazs@ucdavis.edu)

Holly Alpert
Inyo-Mono IRWM Program
(holly@inyo-monowater.org)

Colin Bailey
Environmental Justice Coalition for Water
(colin@ejcw.org)

Andrew Skaggs
California Trout/Inyo-Mono IRWM Program
(askaggs@caltrout.org)

Mike Antos
Council for Watershed Health
(mike@watershedhealth.org)

Lisa Beutler
Water Resources Group, MWH Americas
(lisa-beutler@mwhglobal.com)

Topic 1: Identifying Disadvantaged Communities

Change we seek

New processes and tools for identifying disadvantaged communities achieve the underlying goal of providing equitable access to decision-making and funding for the most disadvantaged people in the state. Members of disadvantaged communities are actively involved in the evolution and continual refinement of an accepted portfolio (toolkit) approach to identifying disadvantaged communities that reflects the locations, needs, and desired benefits of communities with respect to water resources. IRWM groups actively include members of disadvantaged communities or their chosen/trusted representatives in defining selection and prioritization criteria for projects.

Barriers to change

The identification and designation of disadvantaged communities within current IRWM and other water-related programs limit opportunities to receive benefits that can assist in addressing water-related challenges. These problems can be categorized into three areas: 1) terms and processes used to describe “disadvantaged communities” are inadequate and often counter-productive, 2) existing tools used to capture boundaries and problems/needs in communities are not sufficient, and 3) scoring approaches that are based on disadvantaged community definitions and criteria can further disadvantage these communities.

Objectives

- 1) Establish an accepted portfolio approach for identifying and designating disadvantaged communities, enabling these communities to be equitably included and involved in the IRWM process and to achieve community water benefits. This approach is coordinated across agencies and efforts (e.g. SWRCB, DWR-IRWM, CalEnviroScreen, cities and counties).
- 2) Members of disadvantaged communities or their chosen/trusted representatives are active and equal partners in characterizing benefits, boundaries, needs, and project priorities at both the regional and state level.
- 3) State agencies and the broader public have an understanding and appreciation of challenges facing and opportunities within disadvantaged communities.
- 4) Tools are developed that accurately identify: 1) boundaries, 2) needs, 3) community assets, 4) technical and financial resource opportunities for disadvantaged communities.

Recommendations

- 1) *Secure Legislative and agency support to develop a holistic approach for identifying disadvantaged communities across agencies in response to water-related needs.*
 - a. Work with OEHHA, State Water Board (DWP), DWR, and IRWM regions to refine and apply a modified version of the ‘CalEnviroScreen’ approach, or other approaches, for the purpose of identifying disadvantaged communities for IRWM, funding allotments, and other benefits.
 - b. Develop an accountability plan for DWR to regularly report on the impacts of their disadvantaged community identification and engagement approaches.
- 2) *For remaining Prop. 84 money, upcoming Prop. 1 funding, and future funding opportunities, establish a Disadvantaged Community Advisory group to work with DWR to systematize streamlined, alternative “Disadvantaged Community identification approaches.”*

- a. Establish collaboration among members of disadvantaged communities or their chosen/trusted representatives, IRWM groups, and DWR to document currently allowable alternative approaches for disadvantaged community identification.
 - b. Develop and implement an engagement program sponsored by DWR to inform regions and members of disadvantaged communities or their chosen/trusted representatives on potential alternative designation approaches and the established process of submitting alternative MHI criteria.
- 3) *DWR re-evaluates scoring options for projects that benefit members of disadvantaged communities under Propositions 84 and 1 through a pre-PSP comment period.*
- 4) *DWR, in consultation with Disadvantaged Community Advisory group, develops updated solicitation or separate scoring approach for projects that benefit members of disadvantaged communities, using new toolkit that includes methods and guidance.*
- a. Develop a new approach to be used under Prop. 1 and subsequent funding opportunities, well before (i.e., now) grant funds are ready to be administered.
- 5) *To promote increased understanding of disadvantaged communities, DWR & SWRCB actively showcase the realities and projects within disadvantaged communities in the following ways:*
- a. Update DWR website to include links about seven disadvantaged community grant projects and stories from disadvantaged community members.
 - b. State agencies should participate in tours, listening sessions, and multi-media resources as part of a concerted “compassion curriculum” developed in consultation with grant project regions and disadvantaged communities.
 - c. A documentary and/or other media should be developed, building on the Inyo-Mono’s *Living in the Rain Shadow* documentary, to teach viewers about disadvantaged communities and their challenges across the state.

Topic 2: Coordination

Change we seek

All communities in California have equal access to responsive publicly-funded coordinators who build and enhance disadvantaged community capacity to engage with and benefit from state natural resource funding programs.

Barriers to change

State agencies with direct or indirect responsibilities to members of disadvantaged communities are not currently coordinating with each other as well as possible. This lack of coordination results in multiple and confusing venues for engagement, a lack of sharing of lessons and strategies, and an underuse of valuable state capacities and services. As a result, members of disadvantaged communities and their chosen/trusted representatives are unable to effectively influence how funding is directed to provide benefits to their communities. Beyond the seven disadvantaged community grant projects, there has been no sustained effort to coordinate the voices of members of disadvantaged communities and their chosen/trusted representatives to influence statewide IRWM policy and practice.

Objectives

- 1) Regional Water Management Groups are empowered/encouraged to build capacity within disadvantaged communities in their regions through strengthened engagement efforts.
- 2) State agencies work with IRWM regions to strengthen community trust by aligning and collaborating to listen to and learn from disadvantaged communities.
- 3) Increased trust among community members regarding IRWM process due to engagement and successful implementation made possible through community coordination and facilitation.
- 4) Through coordinated engagement among communities and IRWM agencies, achieve more participation and support for plans and projects.

Recommendations

- 1) *State agencies with appropriate authority create ombudsman positions that have adequate qualifications and understanding of disadvantaged communities' needs and the ability for thoughtful explanation to questions by community members who are dissatisfied with IRWM process.*
- 2) *Form an interdepartmental Disadvantaged Community Support Team led by DWR staff that includes state agency disadvantaged community liaisons and regional coordinators, as well as other state agency representatives.*
 - a. Disadvantaged community liaisons and regional coordinators should have adequate qualifications and understanding of disadvantaged community needs.
 - b. DWR should also ensure local communities and IRWM regions are aware of the support team and the availability of resources and disadvantaged community liaisons and regional coordinators.
- 3) *State agencies with appropriate authority hold disadvantaged community "listening sessions" prior to assembling PSPs or grant guidelines to assure disadvantaged community priorities are being addressed by grant programs.*
 - a. This activity is in addition to, not instead of, post-PSP comment period and public workshops.

- 4) *Require and incentivize state/local cost-share for RWMG disadvantaged community coordination efforts. (Greater Los Angeles County is an example.)*
- 5) *State agencies with appropriate authority support advocates in making a case for support to philanthropic sources for regional coordinators.*

Topic 3: Agency Alignment

Change we seek

Through the development of Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM), water planning in California shifts increasingly from the state level to the regional level which is more accessible to disadvantaged communities. Working in conjunction with the Legislature and agency representatives, IRWM programs have become indispensable to California water management and planning, and integration is realized from institutional, programmatic, and geographic standpoints. There is improved collaboration amongst IRWM regions, state agencies, the Governor's Office, and the Legislature, resulting in improved policy, guidelines, and procedures that result in stable, realistic, and sustainable funding programs that include benefits to disadvantaged communities.

Barriers to change

There is often a lack of understanding and communication regarding the water-related challenges faced by disadvantaged communities among those involved with (a) the development of legislation directing the IRWM program, (b) the development of IRWM guidelines, policies, and procedures based on the legislation, and (c) the regional water management groups implementing the use of public funds. This lack of understanding among the Legislature, state agencies, and RWMGs limits the ability to optimize the use of public funds to address the needs of disadvantaged communities within the IRWM program.

Objectives

- 1) Improved alignment among State agencies, the Governor's Office, the Legislature, and IRWM regions to reduce overlap and inefficiency and to more effectively understand and respond to the water-related needs voiced by members of disadvantaged communities or their chosen/trusted representatives.
- 2) Improved collaboration among IRWM regions, State agencies, the Governor's Office, and the Legislature, resulting in improved policy, guidelines, and procedures to create more stable, realistic, and sustainable funding programs.
- 3) Improved and more efficient use of financial and human resources supporting California's IRWM Program.

Recommendations

- 1) *Legislature and DWR increase role of IRWM regions in statewide water management and planning.*
 - a. Develop and implement a process requiring state agencies to consult with IRWM regions to collaboratively develop program guidelines and funding opportunity requirements.
 - b. Establish a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC; with expenses to be covered for participants of the group) to advise on agency alignment and consistency in state water-related policy planning and procedures. The TAC should be comprised of representatives from state agencies, Office of Planning and Research, the Governor's Office, IRWM regions, and members of disadvantaged communities or their chosen/trusted representatives.
 - c. Establish an IRWM Association, an administrative body working on behalf of IRWM

- regions, to inform state agencies and the Legislature in aligning water-related policy, planning, and procedures. Members of the Association may serve on the TAC.
- 2) *DWR improves transparency and accountability of state IRWM program and procedures.*
- a. State agencies develop standardized, consistent, and aligned grant guidelines and requirements for IRWM funding programs. Such guidelines should include transparency of scoring criteria and application evaluation processes and include a formal appeals process to respond to award recommendations.
 - b. State agencies strive towards more transparent and consistent use of the IRWM proposal scoring criteria, evaluation of funding applications, and allocation of funding awards. In addition, state agencies should build on their third party peer-review process for funding applications.
 - c. State agencies develop minimum criteria (and associated minimum score) for awarding funding that are consistent statewide; in response, state agencies should provide regional technical assistance to develop capacity in meeting minimum standards.

Topic 4: Capacity Building and Technical Assistance

Change we seek

Disadvantaged communities are provided the technical assistance and other support necessary to develop their capacity to be self-reliant in meeting their water-related needs. This self-reliance does not mean an absence of outside support and resources, but emphasizes community-capacity to be sustainable and resilient

Barriers to change

Many disadvantaged communities do not currently have the technical, financial, and/or managerial (TMF) capacity to address water resource-related needs. Members of disadvantaged communities often are not aware of technical assistance opportunities. Moreover, technical assistance is limited in scope and is often difficult to access or acquire. Some regional IRWM programs have not prioritized building capacity among and within disadvantaged communities because of other priorities, limited funding for such activities. Additionally, an inability to access resources may exist. As a result, members of disadvantaged communities are unable to adequately address TMF needs.

Objectives

- 1) Increased scope of and access to technical assistance and capacity building programs for disadvantaged communities within IRWM regions.
- 2) Greater self-reliance, sustainability, and resilience within disadvantaged communities to adequately address water resource-related needs.
- 3) Disadvantaged communities are actively and consistently engaging in training opportunities offered by IRWM regions and technical assistance organizations such as Rural Community Assistance Corporation and California Rural Water Association.

Recommendations

- 1) *State agencies with water resources mandates and individual IRWM regions partner to proactively develop and implement technical assistance and capacity building programs that benefit members of disadvantaged communities.*
 - a. Based on identification of regional needs, IRWM regions support the Legislature to secure funding for technical assistance and capacity building programs.
 - b. Develop and implement agency and regional partnership programs to address technical, managerial, and financial assistance needs, including proposal development, project administration, and application fees and other related costs.
 - c. Technical assistance should specifically support facilitation of regional project and program development for water priorities that disproportionately impact disadvantaged communities.
 - d. Agencies and IRWM regions should develop and implement standardized portfolio of activities aimed at increasing capacity of disadvantaged communities to meet water-related challenges, including identification, mapping, needs assessment, technical assistance, and training.
 - e. Incentivize closer collaboration between IRWM groups and technical assistance organizations to increase and improve outreach efforts to disadvantaged communities regarding training opportunities.

- f. DWR to establish a website as a central location for resources that members of disadvantaged communities and their chosen/trusted representatives can use and distribute, including a community outreach/engagement toolkit.

Topic 5: Education

Change we seek

Members of disadvantaged communities are easily able to access information devoted to explaining and teaching about IRWM and water. There exists a clear, transparent, common, and comprehensive understanding of California's IRWM Program, policies, procedures, and opportunities among agency representatives, the Legislature, IRWM Groups, regional stakeholders, and self-selected disadvantaged community members.

Barriers to change

There is a significant lack of understanding of California's Integrated Regional Water Management Program processes among stakeholders at all levels, including members of disadvantaged communities, elected officials that represent those communities, IRWM participants, and agencies. The lack of such understanding undermines the potential involvement of members of disadvantaged communities and their chosen/trusted representatives and other stakeholders as well as the potential to more effectively respond to water-related needs in disadvantaged communities through the IRWM Program.

Objectives

- 1) Agency staff and managers understand the needs of disadvantaged communities, and there is an increased capacity within agencies to be responsive to the needs of community members.
- 2) Members of disadvantaged communities and their chosen/trusted representatives understand the abilities and limitations of agency staff and managers, and the responsibilities and capabilities within IRWM legislation.
- 3) IRWM stakeholders increasingly work together because they understand the opportunities and benefits of collaboration.
- 4) A knowledgeable community is created that understands and can engage in IRWM processes today and as these processes evolve.

Recommendations

- 1) *With sustained funding, DWR establishes and staffs a devoted "institution" to educate and enhance understanding of roles, responsibilities, policies, and procedures of the IRWM Program that can more effectively respond to the needs of disadvantaged communities throughout California.*
 - a. Develop and implement a state-wide education and outreach program targeting members of disadvantaged communities, IRWM practitioners and state-agency representatives with IRWM responsibility to improve engagement and enhance understanding of regional needs and IRWM Program, policies, and procedures.
 - b. At the regional level (or possibly funding-region level), support collaboration among agencies, community-based organizations, and local primary and secondary educational institutions to develop applicable community-specific curriculum to improve engagement between IRWM program participants and members of disadvantaged communities.

Topic 6: Disproportionate Impacts (a): Climate Change

Change we seek

Members of disadvantaged communities are more informed about the impacts of climate and hydrologic change, enabling them to be more resilient and able to adapt to such change.

Barriers to change

Members of disadvantaged communities often do not understand how climate and hydrologic change shape their water-related vulnerabilities, nor do they have plans in place for responding to such impacts. This lack of understanding undermines the abilities of communities to be resilient to the water-related impacts of climatic change.

Objectives

- 1) Members of disadvantaged communities have access to and are able to understand climate and hydrologic change information specific to their area.
- 2) All disadvantaged communities within IRWM regions have up-to-date and complete climate and hydrologic change adaptation plans.

Recommendation

- 1) *State agencies partner with IRWM regions to provide necessary guidance and resources to promote climate change resilience through knowledge enhancement, capacity building, and technical assistance.*
 - a. Create awareness around climate/hydrologic changes and their impacts on/in disadvantaged communities within IRWM regions.
 - b. Develop water-related vulnerability analyses for all disadvantaged communities in California, using existing information and collecting new information if necessary.
 - c. Support capacity building in communities to develop local adaptation planning and actions to respond to climate change impacts.
 - d. Support and require community-level climate change analyses for disadvantaged communities that include vulnerability analysis, impacts analysis, and analysis of adaptation options through planning processes such as CEQA, County General Plans, permitting, and funding applications.
 - e. Develop and implement disadvantaged community-specific water-related adaptation plans to respond to climate change impacts, including emergency response measures and associated natural hazard mitigation actions.

Topic 7: Disproportionate Impacts (b): Public Health

Change we seek

Members of disadvantaged communities are more empowered and able to identify, address, and solve water-related public health problems.

Barriers to change

Members of disadvantaged communities often lack the technical or financial resources to solve drinking water compliance violations, leading to further public health impacts. Furthermore, enforcement of drinking water standards for different kinds of water systems is applied inconsistently between the State Water Board and the California Public Utilities Commission, which regulate public and private water systems, respectively. Such conditions result in disproportionate water-related public health impacts and needs in disadvantaged communities. Lastly, the impact of surface water quality in urban areas on public health remains poorly understood, despite now being a regulatory responsibility of most communities.

Objectives

- 1) Increased regional capacity to address technical and financial resource needs for water quality compliance purposes.
- 2) Consistent and equitable enforcement of drinking water standards.
- 3) Develop an understanding of surface water quality health impacts in urban disadvantaged communities.

Recommendations

- 1) *State and local agencies partner with IRWM regions and individual disadvantaged communities to provide necessary guidance and resources to improve the ability of disadvantaged communities to become compliant with drinking water standards water-systems compliant, to adequately address contaminated groundwater sources, and to decrease the frequency and severity of public health impacts related to water quality.*
 - a. Support and enhance State Water Board Drinking Water Program and California Public Utilities Commission working group in order to ensure inclusion of disadvantaged community issues and standardize enforcement of drinking water standards among all types of water systems.
 - b. Develop and implement standardized methodologies to prioritize and address all known compliance problems related to drinking water standards by 2025.
 - c. Expand and more effectively advertise and make available the current SWRCB program that provides technical and enforcement assistance responders in cases of drinking water and wastewater violations and emergencies.
 - d. Establish an incentivized “big brothers-big sisters” – type program in which more affluent and resource-rich water providers provide resources and assistance to disadvantaged communities and their water systems.
 - e. Ensure long-term institutional support and funding for, and enhance awareness of, the Orphan Sites Cleanup Fund Program within disadvantaged communities.
 - f. Involve members of disadvantaged communities and their chosen/trusted representatives in the design and structuring of a multi-disciplinary technical assistance program as recommended in Prop. 1. Encourage close alignment of all agency efforts.

Topic 8: Governance and Representation

Change we seek

The needs and perspectives of disadvantaged communities are integrated at all levels of participation and governance in Regional Water Management Groups. This representation results in more informed, inclusive, and transparent decision-making within RWMGs. In turn, decision-making will reflect a better understanding of community needs and will lead to more successful projects and more efficient use of public funding. Within the IRWM Program and associated regional programs, there is robust internal and external transparency of RWMGs' evolving participation frameworks and a monitoring and evaluation mechanism that provides RWMGs with constructive feedback on governance structures and opportunities for adaptive management.

Barriers to change

Members of disadvantaged communities have little to no representation in some IRWM regions (in some cases despite explicit attempts by these groups to participate). There is limited information on benefits and challenges of different RWMG governance structures (e.g., JPAs, MOUs, etc.). For example, some structures may conduct business in a way that increases transparency - JPAs are required to follow Brown Act and other laws - while other structures may not be required to inform the general public or its stakeholders of upcoming meetings or meeting agendas. Additionally, some IRWM regions have governance structures that purposely or unintentionally promote "pay-to-play" systems by requiring that only certain types of entities (generally paying members that are local governmental entities) to sit on the governing board. Membership fees, although needed to ensure the ongoing operations of local IRWM groups, are often expensive and infeasible for local DACs.

Objectives

- 1) Improved representation at all levels of governance in IRWM regional activities and adequately promoted and incentivized non-"pay-to-play" structures.
- 2) Provide for more informed decision-making in IRWM regional activities.
- 3) Greater internal and external transparency of evolving IRWM governance frameworks, including pay-to-play and surrogate options that also promote equitable participation and representation.

Recommendations

- 1) *DWR mandate that regional IRWM programs provide opportunities for equitable participation and decision making inclusive of members of disadvantaged communities and their chosen/trusted representatives at all levels of their respective governance structures.*
 - a. Modify IRWM Guidelines/PSPs to establish guidance on requirement to accommodate representatives of disadvantaged communities at all levels of RWMG governance.
 - b. Require an explanation of RWMG compliance in grant applications as a condition of eligibility.
- 2) *DWR create/implement a third-party oversight mechanism to ensure equitable opportunities for participation by members of disadvantaged communities or their chosen/trusted representatives in IRWM programs.*

- a. Create opportunity for State support in defining "participation" (i.e. governance transparency following Brown Act principles, levels of participation, including numbers of board positions, advisory boards, work groups, presence of disadvantaged community coordinator, etc.) and with establishing equitable participation structures.
 - b. Develop and implement a weighted RWMG performance scoring matrix of forms of participation with heavier weighting given to RWMGs that have members of disadvantaged communities or their chosen/trusted representatives participating at all levels of RWMG governance.
- 3) *DWR and IRWM regions support ongoing outreach (with an emphasis on retention) and education for members of disadvantaged communities or their chosen trusted representatives and assist with the development of participatory vehicles such as MOUs, JPAs, etc.*
- a. Seek DWR facilitation and technical assistance as needed, and in support of disadvantaged community coordinator efforts.
 - b. Review statewide IRWM governance models with promising or successful approaches to engagement between IRWM and disadvantaged communities and shared decision-making to inform the development of participatory vehicles.

Topic 9: Funding

Change we seek

Funding for programs and projects that benefit the members of disadvantaged communities is readily accessible. Grant requirements, particularly grant applications and the administration of grant funds, are streamlined and feasible while still satisfying agency mandates and public accountability.

Barriers to change

Because of funding challenges, many disadvantaged communities, especially small, severely disadvantaged communities, are unable to address critical water supply, water quality, and environmental needs. These communities simply lack the capacity to successfully compete for and administer funds to improve their water supplies.

Objectives

- 1) Members of disadvantaged communities and their chosen/trusted representatives are more readily able to secure and administer necessary funds to ensure access to safe, affordable, and reliable water while balancing urban, agricultural and environmental demands.
- 2) Members of disadvantaged communities and their chosen/trusted representatives have access to secure, on-going funding opportunities to maintain program-level operations and mitigate risks associated with gaps in project funding disbursement.
- 3) Grant-funded projects that benefit the members of disadvantaged communities have efficient, cost-effective application, reporting, and payment/reimbursement processes.
- 4) Funding set aside to benefit disadvantaged communities is increased so that members of disadvantaged communities are proportionally (at the very least) represented in needs assessments, funding, governance, outreach, and project benefits (i.e., increase beyond 10% set aside, where relevant).

Recommendations

- 1) *Incentivize and financially support integrated regional water management, state agency-to-state agency and state-to-region coordination, the involvement and capacity building of members of disadvantaged communities and their chosen/trusted representatives throughout California.*

Topic: General

- a. Establish a devoted, non-competitive funding program for disadvantaged communities and their chosen/trusted representatives to access for support of IRWM regional programs, technical assistance, and project implementation.
- b. Develop and include regional incentives for potential grant recipients to include local projects that benefit members of disadvantaged communities in grant applications.
- c. Establish and implement a funding mechanism that provides advances, low-interest loans, and/or bridge-funding for projects that provide benefits to members of disadvantaged communities.
- d. Working in collaboration with the key partners and agencies develop and implement a simplified application process and outline appropriate steps necessary to complete applications.
- e. Establish eligible funding mechanisms for proposal development and application costs

- for projects supporting disadvantaged communities.
- f. Develop and implement more efficient methods for grant administration requirements resulting in more expedited reimbursements.
 - g. Investigate use of electronic fund transfers for faster transmission of funds
 - h. Create a new tool or improve upon existing methods (such as the GRanTS database), for invoice and report submittal to track when invoices are submitted and when reimbursement is issued to increase transparency for agencies administering funds and grant recipients (*e.g.– like Federal Express or UPS tracking systems, or the Federal www.ASAP.gov*).

Topic: Identification

- a. Pursue and secure base funding for each IRWM region to engage in mapping/identification of disadvantaged communities. Using prior work of IRWM regions, particularly those involved with DWR’s Pilot Project Program, is suggested, as is engaging with members of disadvantaged communities or their chosen/trusted representatives to confirm accuracy of boundaries and service areas.
- b. Secure funding to engage researchers and regional experts to conduct comparative assessment of a range of definition processes and methods.

Topic: Alignment

- a. Establish a devoted, annually appropriated funding program to address programmatic needs (including technical assistance and capacity building) and unfunded mandate requirements (such as Salt and Nutrient planning requirements).

Topic: Capacity Building

- a. Based on identification of regional needs, state agencies respond to and support the Legislature to secure funding for technical assistance and capacity building programs.
- b. DWR and SWRCB (state agencies), through direct funding or funding to IRWM regions, staff circuit riders (possibly one per region) to serve as point of contact and consultant to community members regarding water-related issues.

Topic: Education

- a. Secure sustained funding to establish and staff an educational program that serves as a single-point source of information and expertise about the relationship between IRWM and disadvantaged communities.

Topic: Disproportionate Impacts: Public Health

- a. Ensure long-term institutional support and funding for, and enhance awareness of, the Orphan Sites Cleanup Fund Program within disadvantaged communities.

Topic: Governance

- a. Secure funding to hire and employ a neutral outside entity (e.g., academic) to prepare report cards on levels of participation in RWMGs based upon "participation" scoring matrix.
- b. Pursue opportunities to fund and create disadvantaged community coordinator positions in IRWM programs.
- c. Identify funding sources to support involvement of members of disadvantaged communities or their chosen/trusted representatives to reimburse travel and other expenses necessary for participation.

Recommendation Target Audiences

<i>Topic</i>	<i>Primary audience</i>	<i>Secondary audience</i>
Disadvantaged		
Community Identification		
Recommendation 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislature • AgenciesDWR/SWRCB 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IRWM regions
Recommendation 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DWR • DAC Technical Advisory Group 	
Recommendation 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DWR 	
Recommendation 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DWR • DAC Technical Advisory Group 	
Recommendation 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DWR • State Agencies (DWR/SWRCB) 	
Coordination		
Recommendation 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Agencies (DWR/SWRCB) 	
Agency Alignment		
Recommendation 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislature • DWR 	
Recommendation 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DWR 	
Capacity Building and Technical Assistance		
Recommendation 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Agencies (DWR/SRWCB) • IRWM regions 	
Education		
Recommendation 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DWR 	
Disproportionate Impacts		
Recommendation 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Agencies (DWR) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IRWM regions
Recommendation 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Agencies (DWR/SWRCB, CADPH) • Local Agencies (Counties) • IRWM regions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional DACs
Governance and Representation		
Recommendation 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DWR 	
Recommendation 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DWR 	
Recommendation 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DWR • IRWM regions 	
Funding		
Recommendation 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Agencies (DWR/SWRCB) • Legislature 	

Relationship of Disadvantaged Community Workshop Recommendations to California Water Plan Update 2013, Californians without Safe Drinking Water Report, and the California State Water Action Plan.

DAC Recommendation Topic: Disadvantaged Community Identification
CWP Update 2013 Objectives: none
Safe Water Report Recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1. State, regional, and local governments should coordinate to estimate the statewide total population and the population without safe water who reside in areas that are served by a state small water system, local small water system, or private domestic well. • 2. State, regional, and local governments should coordinate to identify those communities, unincorporated areas, and population that rely on inadequate onsite wastewater treatment systems or septic systems. In addition, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) should coordinate with interested stakeholders to determine how to assess the population without adequate sanitation who are part of a centralized wastewater treatment system. • 11. SWRCB and other State agencies should endorse and provide incentives for a job share program that allows tribal drinking water and wastewater operators an opportunity to gain experience at municipal drinking water or wastewater systems.
State Water Action Plan: none

DAC Recommendation Topic: Coordination
CWP Update 2013 Objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 1 - Strengthen Integrated Regional Water Management • Objective 16 - Strengthen Alignment of Government Processes and Tools
Safe Water Report Recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2. State, regional, and local governments should coordinate to identify those communities, unincorporated areas, and population that rely on inadequate onsite wastewater treatment systems or septic systems. In addition, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) should coordinate with interested stakeholders to determine how to assess the population without adequate sanitation who are part of a centralized wastewater treatment system. • 3. State, regional, and local governments along with interested stakeholders should coordinate to develop performance metrics and track the progress to achieve safe drinking water and sanitation for all Californians. Periodic Progress Reports should be prepared that show what progress has been made and what additional actions are needed. • 5. The Department of Water Resource (DWR), SWRCB, California Department of Public Health (CDPH), other State agencies, and tribal governments should establish a workgroup to build relationships and collaboration to identify and address challenges to ensure safe water and sanitation for all tribes in California. This would allow the State to

receive direct advice from the tribal community on issues pertaining to safe water and sanitation and would allow tribes to participate in the planning, development and implementation of water projects, services and policies of State agencies. It also provides an opportunity to further government-to-government relationships. However, this work group would not be considered government-to-government consultation.

- 7. State government should provide incentives for the consolidation, acquisition, or improved management of small water systems.
- 11. SWRCB and other State agencies should endorse and provide incentives for a job share program that allows tribal drinking water and wastewater operators an opportunity to gain experience at municipal drinking water or wastewater systems.
- 13. The Governor's Office of Planning and Research should include in its update of the General Plan Guidelines a recommendation to city and county governments that prior to approval of new developments or facilities, an evaluation should be conducted to determine if the new development or facility can be connected to an existing public water system or if the new development or facility can be operated by an existing permitted public water system. This evaluation could be included in a Water Supply Assessment created to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act or Subdivision Map Act.

State Water Action Plan:

- Page 15 (third bullet)

DAC Recommendation Topic: Agency Alignment

CWP Update 2013 Objectives:

- Objective 16 - Strengthen Alignment of Government Processes and Tools

Safe Water Report Recommendations:

- 2. State, regional, and local governments should coordinate to identify those communities, unincorporated areas, and population that rely on inadequate onsite wastewater treatment systems or septic systems. In addition, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) should coordinate with interested stakeholders to determine how to assess the population without adequate sanitation who are part of a centralized wastewater treatment system.
- 3. State, regional, and local governments along with interested stakeholders should coordinate to develop performance metrics and track the progress to achieve safe drinking water and sanitation for all Californians. Periodic Progress Reports should be prepared that show what progress has been made and what additional actions are needed.
- 5. The Department of Water Resource (DWR), SWRCB, California Department of Public Health (CDPH), other State agencies, and tribal governments should establish a workgroup to build relationships and collaboration to identify and address challenges to ensure safe water and sanitation for all tribes in California. This would allow the State to receive direct advice from the tribal community on issues pertaining to safe water and sanitation and would allow tribes to participate in the

planning, development and implementation of water projects, services and policies of State agencies. It also provides an opportunity to further government-to-government relationships. However, this work group would not be considered government-to-government consultation.

- 7. State government should provide incentives for the consolidation, acquisition, or improved management of small water systems.
- 13. The Governor's Office of Planning and Research should include in its update of the General Plan Guidelines a recommendation to city and county governments that prior to approval of new developments or facilities, an evaluation should be conducted to determine if the new development or facility can be connected to an existing public water system or if the new development or facility can be operated by an existing permitted public water system. This evaluation could be included in a Water Supply Assessment created to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act or Subdivision Map Act.

State Water Action Plan:

- Page 15 (third bullet)

DAC Recommendation Topic: Capacity Building and Technical Assistance

CWP Update 2013 Objectives:

- Objective 4 - Protect and Restore Surface Water and Groundwater Quality

Safe Water Report Recommendations:

- 11. SWRCB and other State agencies should endorse and provide incentives for a job share program that allows tribal drinking water and wastewater operators an opportunity to gain experience at municipal drinking water or wastewater systems.

State Water Action Plan:

- Page 6 (last paragraph)

DAC Recommendation Topic: Education

CWP Update 2013 Objectives: none

Safe Water Report Recommendations:

- 11. SWRCB and other State agencies should endorse and provide incentives for a job share program that allows tribal drinking water and wastewater operators an opportunity to gain experience at municipal drinking water or wastewater systems.

State Water Action Plan: none

DAC Recommendation Topic: Disproportionate Impacts (Climate Change and Public Health)

CWP Update 2013 Objectives:

- Objective 4 - Protect and Restore Surface Water and Groundwater Quality

- Objective 13 - Ensure Equitable Distribution of Benefits

Safe Water Report Recommendations:

- 2. State, regional, and local governments should coordinate to identify those communities, unincorporated areas, and population that rely on inadequate onsite wastewater treatment systems or septic systems. In addition, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) should coordinate with interested stakeholders to determine how to assess the population without adequate sanitation who are part of a centralized wastewater treatment system.
- 4. Ensure implementation of the policy goals of California Water Code Section 106.3 (Assembly Bill [AB] 685), which state that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes.
- 6. State government should remove barriers to local and regional funding for water projects conducted to support disadvantaged and environmental justice communities.
- 10. SWRCB and other State agencies should submit an endorsement letter to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and Congress that the funding allocation should be increased (currently at 2%) for the Safe Drinking Water Act Drinking Water Infrastructure Tribal Set-Aside and Clean Water Act Indian Set-Aside Programs.
- 12. The Legislature, in keeping with the goal of AB 685 that drinking water be safe, clean, affordable, and accessible; should identify a long term source of funding to replace the Proposition 50 and Proposition 84 grant monies, and to provide funding to assist small disadvantaged communities with operation and maintenance costs.

State Water Action Plan:

- Page 2 (third paragraph)
- Page 3 (third paragraph)

DAC Recommendation Topic: Governance and Representation

CWP Update 2013 Objectives:

- Objective 13 - Ensure Equitable Distribution of Benefits
- Objective 16 - Strengthen Alignment of Government Processes and Tools

Safe Water Report Recommendations:

- 4. Ensure implementation of the policy goals of California Water Code Section 106.3 (Assembly Bill [AB] 685), which state that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes.
- 5. The Department of Water Resource (DWR), SWRCB, California Department of Public Health (CDPH), other State agencies, and tribal governments should establish a workgroup to build relationships and collaboration to identify and address challenges to ensure safe water and sanitation for all tribes in California. This would allow the State to receive direct advice from the tribal community on issues pertaining to safe water and sanitation and would allow tribes to participate in the planning, development and implementation of water projects, services

and policies of State agencies. It also provides an opportunity to further government-to-government relationships. However, this work group would not be considered government-to-government consultation.

- 6. State government should remove barriers to local and regional funding for water projects conducted to support disadvantaged and environmental justice communities.
- 7. State government should provide incentives for the consolidation, acquisition, or improved management of small water systems.
- 10. SWRCB and other State agencies should submit an endorsement letter to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and Congress that the funding allocation should be increased (currently at 2%) for the Safe Drinking Water Act Drinking Water Infrastructure Tribal Set-Aside and Clean Water Act Indian Set-Aside Programs.
- 12. The Legislature, in keeping with the goal of AB 685 that drinking water be safe, clean, affordable, and accessible; should identify a long term source of funding to replace the Proposition 50 and Proposition 84 grant monies, and to provide funding to assist small disadvantaged communities with operation and maintenance costs.

State Water Action Plan: Language throughout entire document

DAC Recommendation Topic: Funding

CWP Update 2013 Objectives:

- Objective 4 - Protect and Restore Surface Water and Groundwater Quality
- Objective 17 - Improve Integrated Water Management Finance Strategy and Investments

Safe Water Report Recommendations:

- 4. Ensure implementation of the policy goals of California Water Code Section 106.3 (Assembly Bill [AB] 685), which state that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes.
- 6. State government should remove barriers to local and regional funding for water projects conducted to support disadvantaged and environmental justice communities.
- 8. Support financial mechanisms to facilitate improved and sustainable wastewater removal systems.
- 10. SWRCB and other State agencies should submit an endorsement letter to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and Congress that the funding allocation should be increased (currently at 2%) for the Safe Drinking Water Act Drinking Water Infrastructure Tribal Set-Aside and Clean Water Act Indian Set-Aside Programs.
- 12. The Legislature, in keeping with the goal of AB 685 that drinking water be safe, clean, affordable, and accessible; should identify a long term source of funding to replace the Proposition 50 and Proposition 84 grant monies, and to provide funding to assist small disadvantaged communities with operation and maintenance costs.

State Water Action Plan: Language throughout entire document