

# *SUMMARY*

## Integrated Regional Water Management Disadvantaged Community and Tribal Involvement “Lessons Learned” Summit

November 8<sup>th</sup> – 9<sup>th</sup>, 2018  
Kings Beach, CA

### INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

---

The Disadvantaged Community and Tribal Involvement “Lessons Learned” Summit provided an opportunity for representatives of the twelve Grantees of the Department of Water Resources’ (DWR) Proposition 1 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Disadvantaged Community Involvement Program (DACIP) to come together to share lessons learned, coordinate strategies and approaches, discuss accomplishments, and address issues specific to disadvantaged and Tribal communities. The Summit was sponsored by the Mountain Counties Funding Area, with project lead Sierra Institute for Community and Environment, and consultants Sierra Water Workgroup and California Environmental Indian Alliance, and in partnership with the IRWM Roundtable of Regions and DWR. Attendees included DACIP grant administrators and staff; Tribal Leaders, Tribal members and Tribal NGO representatives; state, federal, and local water agencies; and nonprofits and community organizations.

The goals of the November 2018 Summit were:

- 1) Share DACI program strategies, approaches, and experiences
- 2) Showcase testimonials and success stories
- 3) Demonstrate the importance of comprehensive and collaborative approaches  
 (“Stakeholder Perspectives Recommendations for Sustaining and Strengthening IRWM”)

**Grant Program Background:** On November 4, 2014, California voters approved Proposition 1, the Water Quality, Supply, and Infrastructure Improvement Act. Proposition 1 authorized \$510 million in IRWM grant funding to 12 hydrologic region-based Funding Areas, with a stipulation that no less than 10% (\$51M) of the funds be used for *“ensuring involvement of disadvantaged communities, economically distressed areas [EDAs], or underrepresented communities within regions”* and not less than 10% (another \$51 million) be *“allocated to projects that directly benefit disadvantaged communities”*. DWR subsequently established the DACIP and awarded nearly \$52 million to the 12 funding areas in California. The objectives of the grant program are to ensure the involvement of Disadvantaged Communities, EDAs and underrepresented communities (e.g., Tribes) in IRWM planning efforts in the 48 established regions in the State; to survey and document the needs of these communities in Needs Assessment Reports; and to develop strategies for addressing the needs (including projects that could be eligible for Proposition 1 IRWM implementation funding).

## SUMMIT HIGHLIGHTS

---

Key ideas discussed at the Summit included:

- Engagement needs to incorporate listening, learning, and responding
- Collaboration is key – the most important outcome of DACIP and IRWM work has been the relationships developed
- Words and definitions matter: in conducting assessments, how we define 'need' must reflect agency requirements, yet should also shape agency requirements; care must be taken not to stigmatize nor impose interpretations on communities where assessments are being conducted
- Simple methodologies need to be adapted by learning through experience and listening to feedback, with reciprocity of shared information
- Engagement with Tribal communities is paramount and must be considered a priority within an IRWM and its IRWM plan; Tribal engagement and encouragement for participation needs to be addressed in order to address frustrations and build trust – listen, learn, and respond
- Build capacity at every level – individuals, communities, and State agencies
- There are many different forms of technical assistance
- There is much to learn from the perspectives shared by different groups, organizations, and Tribal communities
- The orientation inside of DWR has evolved, and there is an opportunity to inform the Department; frustration should be expected, but continued communication is necessary
- Accountability is critical – structures should be developed to reflect community feedback in both planning and implementation; follow up with communities after completing assessments to reflect what was heard, ground-truth findings, and communicate next steps

Participants discussed the possibility of holding a second Summit in 2019, noting that it could be useful to have another opportunity to reflect on lessons learned after additional work was completed.

## ATTACHMENTS AND WEB LINKS

---

- Participant list
- Summit Agenda
- Presentations and other materials: <http://www.sierrawaterworkgroup.org/2018-lessons-learned-summit.html>

## DAY 1

---

### Welcome

*Liz Mansfield, Director, Sierra Water Workgroup*

*Jonathan Kusel, Executive Director, Sierra Institute for Community and Environment*

Ms. Mansfield welcomed attendees and noted that the purpose of the Summit was to share the work being done in the IRWM DACIP programs throughout the state. Ms. Mansfield had participants from each of the DACIP Funding Areas, as well as Tribal participants and DWR staff, identify themselves, and introduced Mr. Kusel.

Shelly Covert, Tribal Spokesperson for the Nevada City Rancheria, Tribal Council Member, and Executive Director of California Heritage: Indigenous Research Project, opened the Summit with a spiritual luck song in the Nisenan language, and acknowledged that the Summit was taking place in Washoe territory. Ms. Covert thanked Trina Cunningham, Mountain Maidu and Upper Feather River IRWM, and Sherri Norris, California Indian Environmental Alliance, for helping amplify native voices in water management and said that funding should be provided to increase the involvement of native people in water management.

Ms. Mansfield reviewed the goals (see above) and format of the Summit. In addition to keynote addresses, each day of the Summit included a series of panel discussions in the plenary room followed by a breakout session with further discussion on each of the topics presented in the preceding panels.

Ms. Mansfield then introduced the keynote speaker, Dr. Theopia Jackson, noting that the keynote would be a reminder of the human side of the implementation of the DACIP grant program.

### Keynote Speaker

*Theopia Jackson, PhD*

*Promoting Collaborations: Navigating Troubled Water from a Social Justice Stance*

Dr. Jackson gave a keynote address that shared lessons about integrating social justice into DACIP implementation work. Dr. Jackson is trained in clinical psychology with a specialty in trauma and has also received training from grassroots wisdom keepers. Her presentation used the lens of psychology to discuss building accountability and reciprocity from a social justice angle. She noted that her presentation might make some participants uncomfortable at times but asked participants to “sit in the discomfort so we can stand in the possibilities.”

Dr. Jackson said that understanding complex traumas, including historical and intergenerational trauma, is necessary in order to understand the complexities of engaging with the communities that are called “disadvantaged.” She noted that language affects how we see communities, as well as the psyche of the people living in the communities we are labeling, and emphasized the need to recognize that people are not “at risk” but rather “at potential in at-risk situations.” Dr. Jackson discussed the importance of engaging communities in identifying the challenges they face and the solutions to those challenges, and the need to have flexibility regarding outcomes.

She suggested moving to a strengths-based and trauma-informed orientation that centers around partnering with communities rather than “helping” communities. Dr. Jackson noted that identifying ambassadors, working with leaders within communities, and developing partnerships with others who work with the communities you are engaging with can help build accountability and trust.

At the end of her presentation, Dr. Jackson gave participants an opportunity to comment on her presentation. Participants noted that the challenges Dr. Jackson discussed rang true and asked about how to acknowledge differences between those working in IRWM and the communities they are engaging with. Participants also observed that communities’ energies often get used explaining the current and historical oppression they have faced and noted the importance of giving communities decision-making power. A Tribal elder commented that the structure of grant opportunities itself creates obstacles for Tribal communities, noting that they do not reflect language and intent of the feedback provided by Tribal communities.

## Panel 1: Approaches to Tribal Leadership, Integration, and Engagement in IRWM

*Facilitator: Sherri Norris (Osage Nation; California Indian Environmental Alliance)*

*Speakers/Panel Members:*

- *Trina Cunningham (Mountain Maidu; Upper Feather River IRWM)*
- *Javier Silva (Sherwood Valley Band of Pomo Indians; California Indian Environmental Alliance; North Coast Funding Area)*
- *Atta Stevenson (Cahto Tribe; California Indian Water Commission)*
- *Anecita Agustinez (Diné Navajo Nation; Tribal Policy Advisor, DWR)*

The panel consisted of a Tribal Elder and Tribal representatives who discussed Tribal access and leadership in IRWMs. The panelists opened by recognizing that the Summit was taking place in Washoe territory and noted the significance of Lake Tahoe to the Washoe Tribe as well as its importance for water throughout the State. Panelists discussed the following topics:

- Tribal involvement in IRWM projects: inclusion in IRWM governance and the incorporation of traditional ecological practices
- The challenges to prior Tribal participation are logistical and trust-related and oftentimes begins at the complicated nature of understanding who the Tribal governments and Tribal communities are within an IRWM funding region; often several boundaries overlap, including not only funding boundaries, but Tribal sovereign land, traditional and ancestral lands, and watershed boundaries
- The role of the DACIP in engaging Tribal communities
- The cultural significance of water, including the concepts of human right to water and beneficial use definitions
- Challenges related to trust: historical context of abuse of trust and violations of agreements by the State and U.S. governments; current use of structures like limited waivers of sovereign immunity required in State grant guidelines

- Tribal governments have the additional coordination of working within a federal structure if they are a federally recognized Tribe or a Tribe that is on a public domain or allotment land base
- Issues of jurisdiction: Tribal sovereignty and self-governance; lack of federal recognition of many Tribes within California and the need for a governance structure that includes Tribal communities that are not federally-recognized, including urban Tribal communities whose ancestral homelands are elsewhere; limited waivers of sovereign immunity; need to develop mechanisms for Tribal involvement, including the ability to be grantees, that reflect Tribal sovereignty and do not require Tribes to be subgrantees to counties or other agencies
- Logistical challenges: travel to meetings around a region is cumbersome; there is a need for coordination between Tribes, for example when Tribes are given fewer seats than there are Tribes in the region, and funding is needed to support this coordination
- Tribal capacity-building: working among Tribes to build capacity to engage with agencies, bridge barriers to participation, and work on larger projects

## Panel 2: Approaches to Water/Wastewater Needs Assessment

*Facilitator: Jodie Monaghan (JM Consultants)*

*Speakers/Panel Members:*

- *Holly Alpert (California Rural Water Association, Inyo-Mono IRWM)*
- *Liz Mansfield (Sierra Water Workgroup, Mountain Counties Funding Area)*
- *Jessi Snyder (Self-Help Enterprises, Tulare-Kern Funding Area)*
- *Katie Burdick (Yuba County IRWM, Sacramento Funding Area)*

Panelists presented the needs assessment process in their respective IRWM and funding areas, including approaches, challenges, and preliminary findings. Panelists discussed the following topics:

- **Strategies:** connect with trusted messengers; use outreach as informal needs assessment and use formal needs assessment as a form of outreach; send out introductory letters before beginning needs assessment; hold IRWM workshops; use a combination of surveys, phone interviews, and in-person conversations/meetings, as budget allows; conduct needs assessments on-site instead of asking people to come to you; consider needs assessment in terms of gaining wisdom for decision-making, gauging the interest and knowledge of the communities, committing to filling gaps in data, and sharing information and ground-truthing findings with the communities; connect with your heart and your gut, bring your own vulnerability when asking others to be vulnerable
- **Challenges:** getting responses from small purveyors; determining which providers are inside or outside of the funding area; low attendance at workshops

- Results: water systems face technical, managerial, and financial challenges; water conservation and drought response plans are missing in many areas; awareness of IRWM, and the opportunity to become involved with it, is low; many small water systems are vulnerable to failure; water contamination is a significant issue
- Next steps: additional needs assessments are needed; resource lists need to be developed that will include Tribal contacts and Tribal resources within a funding area; cross-education between local agencies and Tribal communities are needed, including training in grants structure and grant writing, technical assistance, and regional resource centers

### Panel 3: Approaches to Engaging and Understanding Community Capacity Needs

*Facilitator: Colin Bailey (Environmental Justice Coalition for Water)*

*Speakers/Panel Members:*

- *Claire Robinson (Amigos de Los Rios)*
- *Jonathan Kusel (Sierra Institute for Community and Environment)*
- *Mike Antos, PhD (Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority)*
- *Maddie Duda (Environmental Justice Coalition for Water)*

Panelists presented approaches to capacity building by engaging communities and understanding their needs. Panelists discussed the following topics:

- Listening as part of the planning process - engage communities in identifying needs: a community's biggest concerns may center around schools, safety, healthcare, social services, etc., rather than water; engage with community members by constituency; consider underrepresented communities that are not geographically-bounded but have a shared experience, such as homeless populations; begin open-ended
- Honor and build on existing strengths: Tribal traditional ecological knowledge; diverse cultural heritage; consider all five types of capital – financial, social, human, cultural, and physical – and how they contribute to overall capacity; conduct “strengths/assets and needs” assessments; connect groups to share resources
- Connect with communities' needs and concerns broadly: engage with communities' biggest concerns, whether directly related to water or not, to ensure that your involvement will be capacity-building for the community; narratives should speak to communities' needs and strengths; pass funding through to low-resource partners who have existing community connections
- Consider scale: some units of analysis leave area uncovered; aggregation of information to a larger scale can hide dynamics and needs at smaller scales; group and name areas in a way that has meaning for community members; build lasting infrastructure

## Breakout Discussions

Three breakout discussions were conducted, following the same themes and with the same speakers as the Panels 1, 2, and 3 above. The breakout discussions provided a chance to delve deeper into each topic and for participants to provide additional questions and comments.

### *Breakout Group #1: Approaches to Tribal Leadership, Integration, and Engagement in IRWM*

This breakout group discussed approaches to Tribal leadership, integration, and engagement with IRWM, with a focus on conflicts between State funding mechanisms and Tribal sovereignty. The following topics were discussed:

- Contracting processes and funding requirements and their limitations with regard to Tribes
- Limited waivers of sovereign immunity
- How Tribes have been able to receive grant money from State agencies in the past
- Sovereignty of Tribes that are not federally recognized
- Advocacy to resolve this challenge through State-level legislation
- Incorporating Tribes into governance structure of IRWMs
- Incorporating subsistence fishing and Tribal cultural use as beneficial uses in IRWM plans

### *Breakout Group #2: Approaches to Water/Wastewater Needs Assessment*

This breakout group discussed approaches to water/wastewater needs assessment. The following questions and topics were discussed:

- Are there tools (questionnaires, etc.) that funding areas who have already begun or completed their needs assessments can share with other funding areas?
  - Action Item: The team from the Consensus and Collaboration Program at Sacramento State will facilitate the sharing of these resources, such as the DWR template that Sacramento River FA used and the survey that Mountain Counties FA used and uploaded to the Needs Assessment Working Group's Google Drive.
- Including questions about green infrastructure in the needs assessment surveys
- Incorporating findings from needs assessments into decision-making processes – the intersection of needs assessment and project development. Is there funding to assess the outcomes of the needs assessments?
- How to continue engaging with communities in the context of a shifting focus at the State level from IRWM-related planning to Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) planning: How can SGMA, IRWM, and other water planning efforts be integrated? What mechanisms does DWR have for continuing to provide water-related support to DACs if IRWM projects end?
- Timeline for completion of needs assessments and prioritization of funding based on the results of needs assessments. Needs assessments are ever-changing.

- Sources for IRWM funding beyond DWR, such as State Water Board funds and attendance at CA Financing Funding Committee Fairs. It was also mentioned that IRWM collaboration is free and is sometimes organized with little funding on a grassroots level.
- Aligning IRWM projects with regulatory priorities, such as Division of Drinking Water regulations.
- Engaging small water systems. In some areas (e.g., Tulare), bigger agencies may not be willing to invest in small communities. In other areas (e.g., Sacramento River), well-funded groups are more willing to let less-funded projects go first.
- Communicating the collaborative value of IRWM

*Breakout Group #3: Approaches to Engaging and Understanding Community Capacity Needs*

This breakout group discussed approaches to engaging and understanding community capacity needs. The following questions and topics were discussed:

- Engaging communities in an open conversation: balancing the need for communities to define their needs with the need to bring communities into conversations about water issues specifically; important information may be missed if conversations are bounded from the beginning; “listening model” of engagement
- Engaging other agencies and organizations to meet the community’s needs, if they are beyond your agency’s scope
- Identifying communities’ particular connections to water, e.g., related to employment for farm workers; related to safety for parents, etc.
- Consult with people from within the community to identify relevant content and language for asking questions
- Diversity at various levels: hiring diverse staff; engaging with community members of diverse ages
- How to improve response rates to surveys: going to locations where community members already spend time; make sure that the content is considered important to community members; encourage people who do engage to bring others with them; make sure that language is understandable
- How to engage agencies – water agencies, city and county governments, State agencies – in open-ended processes with each other to meet communities’ needs
- Asset-based community development
- Understanding the histories of water issues and other related issues, and addressing these histories
- Developing an iterative process for communicating collective input to DWR and developing institutional capacity



## Day 2

---

### Informal Meeting: DACIP Statewide Working Group Discussion – Comments on Draft PSP for Proposition 1 IRWM Implementation Grant Program

Prior to the opening of Day 2 of the formal Summit, members of the DACIP statewide working group and DWR staff discussed the draft Proposal Solicitation Package for Proposition 1 Implementation grants. Working group participants asked questions of DWR staff regarding the priorities underlying the draft PSP.

### Welcome and Agenda Review

Ms. Mansfield welcomed participants and reviewed the agenda. She introduced keynote speaker Anecita Agustinez, Tribal Policy Advisor for DWR.

### Keynote Speaker

*Anecita Agustinez, Tribal Policy Advisor, DWR*

Ms. Agustinez gave a keynote address focusing on developing, engaging, and defining communities. Ms. Agustinez reviewed the discussions from the first and second panels on Day 1, which centered around Tribal involvement in IRWMs and approaches to needs assessment. Ms. Agustinez noted the importance of defining and creating communities in a way that goes beyond existing borders and boundaries, while recognizing the importance of place. She said that this will impact how we define ourselves, how we measure what we are trying to accomplish, and the inheritance we leave for future generations. Ms. Agustinez noted that the Summit was an example of creating shared cultural values and allies, and that there are many underserved communities throughout the state that need opportunities for this kind of engagement.

## Proposition 1 Disadvantaged Community Involvement Grant Program: Successes and Challenges

*Facilitator: Carmel Brown, Financial Assistance Branch Chief, DWR*

*Panelists:*

- *Lance Eckhart (Colorado River)*
- *Holly Alpert (Lahontan)*
- *Lauren Miller (Mountain Counties)*
- *Katie Burdick (Sacramento River)*
- *Katherine Gledhill (North Coast)*
- *Colin Bailey (San Francisco Bay Area)*
- *Maddie Duda (San Francisco Bay Area)*
- *Natalie LaVan (Central Coast)*
- *Andrew Garcia (San Joaquin River)*
- *Jessi Snyder (Self-Help Enterprises, reporting for Tulare-Kern)*
- *Mike Antos (Santa Ana WPA)*
- *Tania Cerda (Los Angeles and Ventura)*
- *Mark Stadler (San Diego)*

Ms. Brown began the session by providing an overview of the three IRWM programs receiving funding from DWR through Proposition 1, and noted that regions need to update their IRWM plans to be eligible for upcoming implementation funding. Ms. Brown also noted that Goal 14 of DWR's 2018 strategic business plan includes specific objectives relevant to the DACIP program, such as *"Pursue actions and policies that ensure access to safe, clean and affordable water for all Californians"* and *"Provide opportunities for Tribal and Disadvantaged Communities involvement in planning and implementation efforts"*.

Ms. Brown asked the panelists, each representing one of the twelve DACIP Grantees/funding areas, to give a brief update on the successes and challenges faced in their funding area.

Panelists discussed the following challenges, successes, and lessons learned:

- **Challenges:** working with rural communities; working with communities and watersheds that have divergent needs; engaging with communities that are dealing with many challenges; watersheds that overlap multiple funding areas strain resources; balancing needs across projects that are at different stages; expectations not matched to what the program does
- **Successes:** region-specific case studies; subcommittees to help identify varied needs; investments in source regions have outsized impacts around the State; building upon existing efforts by working with local partners, including organizations and individual experts; coordination with Proposition 1 and SGMA implementation; routine, intentional communication to overcome the challenge of diverse characteristics and needs

- Lessons learned: conflict is a necessary element of paradigm shift, whether cultural, institutional, or programmatic, and can be managed and leveraged; decision-making processes should be detailed and well-understood; most challenges have solutions, but many of the solutions are time-consuming; collaborating via established, existing engagement venues can help avoid causing “meeting fatigue;” new ways of identifying and targeting areas in need are needed, going beyond DAC and CalEnviroScreen definitions; many benefits of IRWM cannot be measured

Ms. Brown reviewed the timeline and new process for DWR’s next round of grant solicitation for implementation projects. She noted that the new process is intended to: make funding available in a more proactive way than the “reactive” solicitations of the past; be more transparent and inclusive; and encourage regional stakeholders to collaborate on long-term planning strategies that consider when funding from other federal/local sources will be available to leverage these State funds. She explained that the new process includes a longer pre-application process, including workshops and feedback from DWR, as well as a review for eligibility and completeness prior to scoring the applications. There will be two rounds of funding, with no less than 10% (\$51 million) designated for projects that benefit disadvantaged communities. Funding areas/regions can apply for funding for DAC-benefit projects in the first round, but the expectation is that some of those resources are reserved for Round 2 for projects identified/developed as a result of the in-progress DACIP Needs Assessments.

### Piloting a New Tool for Identifying Underserved and Disadvantaged Communities

*Boykin Witherspoon, CSU Water Resources and Policy Initiatives*

Mr. Witherspoon gave a presentation about a project he is leading with graduate students at the California State University (CSU) on behalf of the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority and Greater LA County DACIPs, that looks at how to refine the identification and prioritization of underserved and disadvantaged communities in the State. The existing framework and DWR GIS Mapping Tool uses census tracts as the geographical unit of analysis and a binary system in which a tract either qualifies or does not qualify as needing assistance. The new tool being piloted by CSU uses a multi-index map that creates a “stress index,” combining CalEnviroScreen, median household income, and a social vulnerability index to provide a more nuanced understanding of communities and their needs. The tool will be refined to apportion population so that the geographical units are better aligned with communities’ boundaries. Information about the boundaries of flood control districts, resource conservation districts, and other agencies will also be included. Mr. Witherspoon noted that State agencies currently use different criteria to define DACs; this project will be used to propose a regulatory framework for more consistent program implementation across State agencies.

Participants noted the importance of developing a rural-specific set of metrics, accounting for the lack of data about certain communities, incorporating a community review process to ground-truth the appropriateness of the tool’s pilot test findings, and leveraging the CSU student population to encourage use of the tool.

## IRWMs – How to Move Forward? Challenges & Opportunities

### *Legislative & Tribal Perspectives / Open Discussion*

*Facilitator: Lynn Rodriguez (Watersheds Coalition of Ventura County)*

*Panelist:*

- *Alf W. Brandt (Senior Counsel to Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon)*

This session centered on the role of State legislators in the future of IRWM and inclusion of Tribes, with Mr. Brandt addressing questions and comments from Ms. Rodriguez as well as Summit participants. (Note that the session was originally scheduled to be a two-person panel discussing both legislative and Tribal perspectives, but Caleen Sisk, Tribal leader of the Winnemem Wintu Tribe, was unable to attend the Summit.) Topics discussed during the session included:

- Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon's work on water quality and accessibility for communities around California: improved transparency from private water suppliers through the passage of AB 240; and removal of manganese from water in Maywood, in Speaker Rendon's district
- Opportunities for support and leadership from legislators on IRWM: communities and agencies need to communicate the value of IRWM to legislators – support for the approach is waning but legislators are responsive to their constituents; there are opportunities for legislators to support IRWM through appropriation of funding; regional processes are critical; legal rulings, for example around accountability for contamination in waterways, are changing the context of local and State legislation
- Incentives and barriers to promoting integration in water management: funding can be an incentive, yet lack of upfront funding is a barrier for some groups; issues of trust, especially with Tribal communities and others that have been historically excluded and oppressed; need for funding for planning and capacity-building; overhead costs
- Challenges of Tribal involvement: need to ensure that Tribal water rights are included in future legislation; importance of involving Tribes in funding, including explicit language in legislation; contracting issues, including issues of accountability and Tribes' status as sovereign governments above the level of local governments; issues of trust; need to acknowledge the land and histories of Tribal communities

Mike Floyd, DWR, discussed the April 2017 report *Stakeholder Perspectives: Recommendations for Sustaining and Strengthening IRWM*. Mr. Floyd explained the multi-year process of stakeholder outreach and workshops to develop the document, noting that it is a dynamic document and additional concerns and ideas should be added in the future. The report presents input from stakeholders about the future of IRWM, including 70 actions grouped into four broad strategies.

## Panel 4: Leveraging Resources – Partnerships and Long-Term Strategies

*Facilitator: Mark Stadler (SDCWA)*

*Panelists:*

- *Lance Eckhart PG, CHg (Mojave Water Agency, Mojave IRWM)*
- *Katie Burdick (Yuba County IRWM, Sacramento Funding Area)*
- *Jennifer Hazard (Rural Community Assistance, San Diego IRWM)*
- *Tania Cerda /Peter Massey (TreePeople, Greater L.A. Funding Area)*

Panelists discussed strategies for meaningful, long-term engagement with communities. Topics discussed included:

- Adaptive approaches: updating plans to reflect stakeholder feedback; embracing prioritization and triage; pursuing additional sources of funding
- Concrete strategies for meaningful engagement: having transparency around processes; using graphics and straightforward language to communicate information; spending time listening instead of talking, connecting with community leaders
- Partnerships: developing partnerships to gain needed expertise; technical assistance partnerships to support processes from needs assessment through implementation
- Accountability and oversight: establish formal structures for oversight; understand that community engagement is an ongoing process; feedback needs to be reflected in both the plan and its implementation, because people have invested their time in the needs assessment

## Panel 5: Technical Assistance – What’s Worked? What’s Been Learned? At what level can we provide (toolboxes, project oriented, data sharing and management, capacity building)?

*Facilitator: Carmel Brown, Branch Chief of Financial Assistance, DWR*

*Panelists:*

- *James Maughan (Assistant Deputy Director, SWRCB)*
- *Pablo Figueroa (Environmental Manager, RCAC)*
- *Colin Bailey (Executive Director, EJCW)*
- *Javier Silva (CIEA, Sherwood Valley Band of Pomo, North Coast Funding Area)*

Panelists introduced themselves, noting their experience working in technical assistance, and discussed challenges and opportunities for technical assistance programs. Panelists discussed the following topics:

- Challenges: continuity; start-up costs; building trust; technical assistance needs to be done in concert with community engagement; slow contracting processes; timing of engagement and compliance schedules; high turnover of technical assistance staff; assessment fatigue and need for results; limitations on funding uses; tension between

needs for outreach-focused and project-focused technical assistance; contracting, reporting, and auditing processes

- Opportunities: Proposition 1 funding moves quickly and is not tied to funding area; build on information from completed assessments; communicate the link between findings from needs assessments with subsequent work; collaboration between technical assistance provider groups with different expertise
- Successes: hire of a bilingual outreach staff person at DWR; face-to-face technical assistance; transparent processes, including needs assessment and selection of projects; involvement of Tribal representatives; recognition that communities, including Tribal communities, within a region need to work in unison while having disparate needs

Ms. Brown offered the support of facilitators from the Consensus and Collaboration Program at CSU Sacramento to assemble an on-line clearinghouse (“toolbox”) of templates and other tools developed by the 12 DACIP grantees around the state. For example, the clearinghouse could include advisory committee and collaboration committee charters, communication plans, surveys, educational materials, and so on. A related service, if of interest and resources allowed, could be developing a framework for a peer mentoring network.

## Breakout Discussions

Two breakout discussions were conducted following the same themes and with the same speakers as Panels 4 and 5 above. The breakout discussions provided a chance to delve deeper into each topic and for participants to provide additional questions and comments.

### *Breakout Group #4: Leveraging Resources – Partnerships and Long-Term Strategies*

This breakout group discussed leveraging partnerships and long-term strategies. The following questions and topics were discussed:

- Leveraging on the skillsets of the communities, for example consensus skills among Tribal communities; building on existing skillsets
- Balancing a focus on infrastructure needs with cultural awareness and understanding of contextual particulars – making connections between the human and infrastructure sides of a need; establishing mentoring programs to teach community members the technical skills needed to be self-reliant
- Networking: connect with local leaders; identify and connect with the community’s champions; work with State agencies and nonprofits that are already engaged in the area; the need to access and create a Tribal database within each funding area; a first step is to contact the Native American Heritage Commission for a listing of interested Tribes per CEQA guidelines; however it is incumbent upon each DACIP to develop their database of contacts within their regions
- How to balance addressing the needs of as many communities as possible with limited resources (funding and time): prioritize starting with projects that have buy-in and are

likely to succeed vs. prioritizing those with the greatest need; bundle small projects in high-need communities

- How to improve outreach and “marketing” of efforts?
- Working with agencies that have not historically worked well together – establishing a regional advisory committee
- Using DACIP funding to prioritize empowerment and resilience of DAC communities, building understanding of water systems rather than focusing on developing and completing projects – which is the focus of traditional IRWM programs

*Breakout Group #5: Technical Assistance – What’s Worked? What’s Been Learned?*

This breakout group discussed technical assistance in a conversation between panelists and Summit participants. The following questions and topics were discussed:

- Is there still Proposition 1 funding available, or is there potential within Proposition 68, for technical assistance?
- Balancing consistency and responsiveness to communities’ distinct needs, incorporating accountability about the needs articulated by communities
- Institutionalizing communication channels between the 9 Regional Water Quality Control Boards and the State Water Board to coordinate technical assistance
- Mechanisms for Tribes to receive technical assistance, including how to give Tribes a say in which technical assistance providers they work with
- Roles that counties can play in providing technical assistance through State funding
- Tying together technical assistance and capacity-building work
- Conducting follow-up site visits with communities after completing needs assessments – including reporting back what was heard, asking if there is additional information communities would like to provide, and developing and finding funding for work plans to address the needs
- State Water Board technical assistance: technical assistance must be tied to a project or be an idea of a project; before funding, a technical, managerial, and financial (TMF) analysis is required; small communities (i.e., 10 homes) will likely not be funded with Water Board funding; there is so much need for funding that the Board is working on the projects that they can fund today while hoping they can fund the others later
- Incorporating qualitative metrics around community involvement and engagement in determining a project’s success and effectiveness
- Including technical assistance as a Supplemental Environmental Project option (link: [https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water\\_issues/programs/enforcement/sep.html](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/enforcement/sep.html))
- Technical assistance-related data, mapping, and visualization programs: Southern Sierra regions can buy into a program; CSU Water Resources and Policy Initiatives data is uploaded to the CSU San Bernardino Library

- Leveraging small amounts of funding across multiple IRWMs – consolidation vs. regionalization
- Addressing operations and maintenance needs
- Incorporating affordability as an objective of IRWM, and considering how technical assistance can support this objective

## Summit Closure

*Liz Mansfield, Director, Sierra Water Workgroup*

*Jonathan Kusel, Executive Director, Sierra Institute for Community and Environment*

Mr. Kusel summarized key takeaways from the Summit. One was the need for engagement with communities to incorporate ongoing communication, adaptability, accountability, and capacity-building. Another central theme was the need for continued engagement with Tribal communities to listen, learn, and respond to continued frustrations. See the *Highlights* section for additional key takeaways.

Ms. Mansfield thanked the speakers and the attendees for their candid participation, spoke of the interest expressed for another summit elsewhere in California in 2019, and adjourned the Summit.



## Participant List

- Alexander Tavizon, California Indian Environmental Alliance
- Alf W. Brandt , Senior Counsel to Assembly Speaker Rendon
- Allison Dodds, Inyo-Mono IRWMP
- Andrew Garcia, San Luis & Delta Mendota Water Authority
- Anecita Agustinez , Tribal Policy Advisor, Department of Water Resources
- Boykin Witherspoon, CSU Water Resources and Policy Initiatives
- Carmel Brown, Department of Water Resources
- Chelsea Spier, Department of Water Resources
- Claire Robinson , Amigos de Los Rios
- Colin Bailey , Environmental Justice Coalition for Water
- Desiree Ramirez, Department of Water Resources
- Dustin Hardwick, California Rural Water Association
- Eliana Camargo, Department of Water Resources
- Eric Martinez, Department of Water Resources
- Eric Wedemeyer, Shasta County
- Erin Crandall, Financial Assistance Branch/ Department of Water Resources
- Greg Thrush, The Sierra Fund
- Holly Alpert, Inyo-Mono IRWM Program
- Ian Sims, Honey Lake Valley RCD
- James Maughan , State Water Resources Control Board
- Javier Silva Nonwork, North Coast Representative
- Jennifer Hazard, Rural Community Assistance Corporation (RCAC)
- Jessi Snyder, Self-Help Enterprises
- Jessica Arm, Department of Water Resources
- Jim Long, Department of Water Resources
- Jo-Joe Lee, California Indian Environmental Alliance
- Jodie Monaghan, Sierra Water Workgroup
- John Flores, San Diego IRWM, San Pasqual Tribe
- John Shelton, Southern Sierra IRWM
- Jon Trochez, LA County Department of Public Works
- Jonathan Kusel , Sierra Institute for Community and Environment
- Julia Van Horn, Consensus and Collaboration Program, CSUS
- Katherine Gledhill, North Coast Resource Partnership
- Kathleen Firstenberg, CSU Water Resources and Policy Initiatives
- Katie Burdick, Burdick & Company/Yuba Water Agency and Yuba County IRWM
- Kayla Meyer, Honey Lake Valley RCD
- Kyle Ericson, El Dorado County Water Agency
- Lance Eckhart PG, CHg, Mojave Water Agency, Mohave IRWM
- Lauren Miller , Sierra Institute for Community and Environment
- Leah Wills, Plumas County Planning Department
- Liz Mansfield, Sierra Water Workgroup

- Lynn Rodriguez , Watersheds Coalition of Ventura County
- Maddie Duda , Environmental Justice Coalition for Water
- Maks Khashchuk, Department of Water Resources
- Malka Kopell, Consensus and Collaboration Program, CSUS
- Marian Henrici, California Rural Water Association
- Mark Stadler, San Diego County Water Authority
- Melinda Barrett, Mariposa County Resource Conservation District
- Melissa Sparks-Kranz, Association of California Water Agencies
- Mike Antos, Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority
- Mike Floyd, Department of Water Resources
- Natalie LaVan, Regional Water Management Foundation
- Pablo Figueroa , Environmental Manager, RCAC
- Patricia Vellines, Department of Water Resources
- Peter Massey, TreePeople
- Rachel Ehlers, Legislative Analyst's Office
- Randell S. Wilson, Plumas County Planning Department
- Randy Yonemura , CIWC, Mountain Counties Funding Area
- Rick Kattelmann, Inyo Mono Regional Water Management Group
- Samantha Greene, Santa Clara Valley Water District
- Sherri Norris, California Indian Environmental Alliance
- Stacey Hafen, North Cal-Neva RC&D Council
- Tania Cerda, Greater L.A. Funding Area
- Teji Sandhu, Department of Water Resources
- Theopia R. Jackson, PhD, Saybrook University Department of Humanistic and Clinical Psychology
- Tom Keegan, California Rural Water Association
- Tom Trott, Twain Harte CSD
- Trina Cunningham, Upper Feather IRWM, Mountain Maidu
- Uma Hinman, Upper Feather River IRWM
- Valerie Hurst , Sierra Institute for Community and Environment
- Vanessa Nishikawa, Stantec