



## CEAC Board of Directors

9th Annual CEAC Policy Conference  
Thursday, September 18, 2014 ~ 2:30-4:30pm  
CSAC Conference Center  
1020 11<sup>th</sup> Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Sacramento, Sacramento County



- 
- 2:30 pm
1. **Call to Order** (McGolpin)
  2. **Approval of Minutes, March 28, 2014** (Secretary) - **Attachment One**
  3. **Correspondence** (McGolpin)
  4. **CLODS Report** (CLODS)
  5. **NACE Report** (DeChellis)
  6. **CSAC Report** (CSAC Staff)
  7. **Regional Directors Reports**
  8. **Treasurers Reports** (Sadjadi) – **Attachment Two**
  9. **Committee Reports**
    - a) Flood Control and Water Resources
    - b) Solid Waste **(Action Item) Recommended Action:** Name Change to “Resource Recovery and Waste Management”
    - c) Surveyor
    - d) Land Use
    - e) Transportation
    - f) Oversight and Special Tasks Committee
  10. **Other Committee Reports**
    - a) Fellowship
    - b) Scholarship (Kowalewski)
    - c) Outside Committees (HBP, CUCCAC, CCSFCC, SHSIP, TRCC, CTCDC, FLAP, TDAWG)
- 3:30pm
11. **Life Membership**
  12. **Unfinished Business**
    - a) Proposed General Services Committee (Mattson)
    - b) CEAC Bylaws (Mattson)
    - c) White Paper: Strategy to Fund Flood Protection and Water Quality Services –**Attachment Three (Action Item). Recommended Action:**
      - (1) Approve providing technical support to CSAC as a member of the Reform Proposition 218 Coalition (Coalition).
      - (2) Approve contract with Watershed Resources Consulting to supply staff resources to the Coalition. It is estimated that staff costs could be approximately \$5000 per month based on past expenditures (Draft Work Plan and Scope of Work, attached)



**CEAC Board of Directors**  
 9th Annual CEAC Policy Conference  
 Thursday, September 18, 2014 ~ 2:30-4:30pm  
 CSAC Conference Center  
 1020 11<sup>th</sup> Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
 Sacramento, Sacramento County



12. **Unfinished Business (Cont'd)**

- (3) Approve Supplemental Assessment to the CEAC annual dues to raise revenue to pay for the staff resources costs
- (4) Amend the appropriation approved at the March, 2014 meeting from \$10,000 -\$14,000.
- (5) Recommend that CSAC join the Coalition.

13. **New Business**

- a) CEAC Affiliate Dues/Invoice (McGolpin): **Attachment Four (Informational Item)**
- b) Institutionalizing Communications in CEAC (Gin)
  - 1. Communications ad hoc committee
  - 2. Communications element within conferences

14. **Scheduled Conferences**

- a) CSAC 120<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting, Anaheim, Orange County, November 18-21, 2014
- b) CEAC Spring Conference/League PWOI, Newport Beach, Orange County, March 25-27, 2015
- c) NACE Annual Conference, Daytona Beach, Florida, April 19-23, 2015

15. **CEAC Board of Directors Meeting Schedule**

- a) November 21, 2014, 11:00am (Annual Meeting)
- b) March 27, 2014, TBD (Spring Conference)

4:30pm

**Adjourn**

**Meeting Roster**

<b>Officer</b>	<b>Office</b>	<b>County</b>
Scott McGolpin	President	Santa Barbara
Michael Penrose	President-Elect	Sacramento
Matt Machado	Secretary	Stanislaus
Mehdi Madjd-Sadjadi	Treasurer	Marin (Retired)
Doug Wilson	Parliamentarian	Tulare (Retired)
Ken Miller	Newsletter Editor	San Bernardino (Retired)
Tom Mattson	Past President	Humboldt
Patrick DeChellis	NACE Representative	Los Angeles
Dave Gravenkamp	Historian	Siskiyou County (Retired)
<b>Regional Directors</b>	<b>Region</b>	<b>County</b>
Steven Kowalewski	Bay Area	Contra Costa
Scott DeLeon	Northern California	Lake
Panos Kokkas	Sacramento Mother Lode	Yolo
Dan Gibbs	San Joaquin Valley	Fresno



## CEAC Board of Directors

9th Annual CEAC Policy Conference  
 Thursday, September 18, 2014 ~ 2:30-4:30pm  
 CSAC Conference Center  
 1020 11<sup>th</sup> Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
 Sacramento, Sacramento County



### Meeting Roster (Continued)

<b>Committee Chairs</b>	<b>Committee</b>	<b>County</b>
John Presleigh	Central Coast	San Luis Obispo
Vincent Gin	Southern California	Orange
Susan Klassen	Transportation	Sonoma
Pattie McNamee	Fellowship	Contra Costa (Retired)
Chris Stone	Flood Control/Water Resources	Los Angeles
Rick Marshall	Land Use	Napa
Jim Porter	Oversight	San Mateo
Steven Kowalewski	Scholarship	Contra Costa
Pat Proano	Solid Waste	Los Angeles
Steven Steinhoff	Survey	Los Angeles
<b>CSAC/CEAC Staff</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Agency/County</b>
Karen Keene	Senior Legislative Representative	CSAC
Kiana Buss	Legislative Representative	CSAC
Cara Martinson	Legislative Representative	CSAC
Chris Lee	Legislative Analyst	CSAC
Merrin Gerety	CEAC Program Manager	CSAC/CEAC

## **ATTACHMENTS**

---

Attachment One .....March 28, 2014 Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

Attachment Two .....Treasurer's Reports

Attachment Three .....Strategy to Fund Flood Protection and Water Quality  
Services

Attachment Three .....CEAC Affiliate Dues/Invoice

## **Attachment One**

---

March 28, 2014 Board of Directors Meeting Minutes



**CEAC Board of Directors Meeting**  
 CEAC Spring Conference  
 Friday, March 28, 2014 ~10:15am – 12:15pm  
 Sheraton Grand Hotel, Falor Room, Second Level  
 Sacramento, Sacramento County

**Call to Order** (McGolpin) Meeting was called to order at 12:00 pm on Friday, March 28, 2014. Due to time constraints the meeting was continued until a later date. The meeting was re-opened at 10:05 am on Friday, April 3, 2014.

**Meeting Roster:**

<b>Officer</b>	<b>Office</b>	<b>County</b>
Scott McGolpin	President	Santa Barbara
Michael Penrose	President Elect	Sacramento
Matt Machado	Secretary	Stanislaus
Mehdi Madjd-Sadjadi	Treasurer	Marin (Retired)
Doug Wilson	Parliamentarian	Tulare (Retired)
Ken Miller	Newsletter Editor	San Bernardino (Retired)
Tom Mattson	Past President	Humboldt
Patrick DeChellis	NACE Representative	Los Angeles
Dave Gravenkamp	Historian	Siskiyou (Retired)
<b>Regional Directors</b>	<b>Region</b>	<b>County</b>
Stephen Kowalewski	Bay Area	Contra Costa
Scott DeLeon	Northern California	Lake
Vacant	Sacramento Mother Lode	
Dan Gibbs	San Joaquin Valley	Fresno
Paavo Ogren	Central Coast	San Luis Obispo
Vincent Gin	Southern California	Orange
<b>Committee Chairs</b>	<b>Committee</b>	<b>County</b>
Susan Klassen	Transportation	Sonoma
Pattie McNamee	Fellowship	Contra Costa (Retired)
Chris Stone	Flood Control/Water Resources	Los Angeles
Rick Marshall	Land Use	Napa
Jim Porter	Oversight	San Mateo
John Presliegh	Scholarship	Santa Cruz
Pat Proano	Solid Waste	Los Angeles
Steven Steinhoff	Survey	Los Angeles
<b>CSAC/CEAC Staff</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Agency/County</b>
Karen Keene	Senior Legislative Representative	CSAC
Kiana Buss	Legislative Representative	CSAC
Cara Martinson	Legislative Representative	CSAC
Merrin Gerety	CEAC Program Manager	CSAC/CEAC
Chris Lee	Legislative Analyst	CSAC/CEAC

<b>Other Attendees</b>		
Mark Schleich		Santa Barbara

**All Officers, Regional Directors, Committee Chairs and Staff are listed. Those shown shaded were not in attendance.**

**2. Approval of Minutes –**

- November 22, 2013 minutes - Upon a motion by Mehdi Sadjadi and second by Tom Mattson, were **unanimously approved**. Abstained by DeChellis, DeLeon, Ogren.

**3. Correspondence (Scott McGolpin)**

- Regarding the topic of disaster assistance, road commissioner authority and emergency work and procurement, Scott McGolpin as CEAC President sent letters to Cal OES and FEMA expressing our frustration and concern with the existing process and described our current effort of drafting a white paper which will summarize the justification and explanation of Road Commissioner authority, emergency contracting under Public Contract Code and scope of work and pricing as defined by Caltrans as “force account” contracting. The letters requested that both Cal OES and FEMA actively participate in this white paper, building and showing a strong partnership. Cal OES did provide a response in writing stating their support in development of this white paper.
- Also discussed was a change order for the CEAC centennial video consultant to include travel costs at a cost of ~\$770.00. This amount was a part of the budget, no action needed for this CCO. Discussed that future contracts should include a small contingency.

**4. CLODS Report (CLODS) –** Mehdi Sadjadi reported that the Buffalo Bull Award went well. Compliments to Ken Miller. It was the best, funniest award in recent memory. Thanks to Tom Mattson and Rick Tippett for being a big part of the award. In terms of Fall Conference, the CLODS will expect a recommendation for new officers, before Policy Conference. Keep recommendation to just three. The Fall Conference will include the CLODS BBQ.

**5. NACE Report (Patrick DeChellis) –** Upcoming NACE event includes the 2014 Annual Conference in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, April 13-17. Anticipating a good turnout from California. It appears that the Western VP of NACE will be the next secretary/treasurer for NACE, leaving the Western VP position open. The current NACE President has reached out for nominations. After careful review Julie Bueren has been selected to be the next Western VP for NACE. Additionally, the Western Regional NACE conference in Laughlin, Nevada, will be November 5-7. Patrick highly recommends all that can, should attend. Also discussed was playing the centennial video at the NACE events. Regarding NACE Annual Conference there was discussion about the engineers of the year, project management awards and dinner events.

**6. CSAC Report (CSAC Staff) –** Merrin provided an update on the Spring conference. There were 183 attendees (including full and one-day registrations, and sponsors), 14 sponsors, it was a great event. Extra thanks to Quincy Engineering for the golf tournament. CSAC Legislative Conference is scheduled for May 14-15 in Sacramento. There will be good speakers and very timely topics discussed. The 2015 Spring/Joint Conference with League of California Cities will be

March 25-27 in Newport Beach Hyatt. Recently kicked off the annual affiliate sponsorship effort – there are already 5 platinum sponsors. The CEAC website is now charging for website job postings; there has been a good response on this tool.

**7. Regional Directors Reports**

- San Joaquin Valley – Dan Gibbs reported that there have been two meetings this year. The most recent meeting included Will Kempton as the speaker. The next meeting will be in April in Kern County.
- Northern California – Scott DeLeon reported that the last meeting in January with 17 attendees. Scott is planning to tour other regions and counties to get to know them.
- Central Coast – Paavo reported that their last meeting was just after the president's retreat and their next meeting will be in the fall in Monterey, just prior to the fall conference.
- Bay Area – No Report
- Southern California – No Report
- Sacramento Motherlode – No Report

**8. Treasurers Report (Sadjadi)** – Attached are three reports for review, including the final report for 2013, a budget for this current year, and the current treasurer report for 2014. A couple of items highlighted as part of the budget include: Contract for \$15,000 for CalOES / FEMA white paper contract, CSAC contract increased by 2.5%. Motion to approve the Report by Patrick DeChellis, Seconded by Matt Machado – **unanimously approved.**

**9. Committee Reports**

- a) Flood Control and Water Resources – See below under new business. Additionally, there were presentations from a Flood Board member and water board staff.
- b) Solid Waste – Proposed name change in committee to better reflect what they do, i.e. – resource recovery. Good discussion about solid waste in each county. Mark Schleich provided an update on legislative issues
- c) Surveyor – No Report
- d) Land Use – No Report
- e) Transportation – No Report
- f) Oversight and Special Tasks Committee – No Report

**10. Other Committee Reports**

- a) Fellowship – Outstanding job, great hospitality suite. Tip jar to raise money for scholarship was a good idea and raised money.
- b) Scholarship (Steve Kowalewski) – Direct checks can be written off, versus the tip jar.
- c) Outside Committees (HBP, CUCCAC, CCSFCC, SHSIP, TRCC, CTCDC, FLAP, TDAWG) – Patrick DeChellis (Bridge Committee) reported on lack of bridge set aside program for on-on-system non NHS. Additionally, need to look at performance measures for bridges. Tom Mattson reported on Transportation Coop Committee that their discussion led to need for a safety committee to include 2 CEAC members, Rural County Task Force, 2 League of Cities, Caltrans, FHWA, trying to set a meeting for June. Hot topics include form 1273, audits ongoing. Patrick DeChellis commented FLAP (Federal Lands) process



coming up, for a call for projects.

11. **Life Membership** - None

12. **Unfinished Business**

- a) General Service Committee Survey – continuing discussion at oversight
- b) CEAC Bylaws – Tom Mattson will pursue a phone conference to further discuss.

13. **New Business**

- a) White Paper: Strategy to Fund Flood Protection and Water Quality Services – **Attachment Four (Action Item)** – Mitch Avalon shared that the flood control policy committee discussed a strategy to fund flood control and stormwater infrastructure. Looming costs, declining state and federal funds, and the fact that tax measures are not easily passed with the 2/3 majority. The committee developed a 3 part strategy. 1) Develop needed legislation to modify prop 218, to be more similar to water and wastewater measures, similar to a utility. To make this change will require a ballot measure. A ballot measure will need a coalition and sponsors, 2) Build coalition of support, for legislation support and a campaign effort. 3) Once stormwater exemption is approved conduct legal analysis to implement through different districts. This strategy was approved by the committee and there is sub-committee being formed now. Funding this initial effort will be excess funds from flood control needs assessment (~\$14,000). Asking for action by board to approve strategy. Motion to support strategy and efforts by sub-committee by Patrick DeChellis, seconded by Tom Mattson – **unanimously approved**. Comment by Ken Miller to have sub-committee develop a budget for the \$14,000.

14. **Scheduled Conferences**

- a) NACE Annual Conference, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, April 13-17, 2014
- b) Public Works Secretarial Conference May 21-23, 2014
- c) CEAC Policy Conference, Sacramento County, ~~August 27-28, 2014~~ Changed to September 17-18, 2014 (due to high cost of hotel rooms in August)
- d) CSAC 120<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting, Anaheim, Orange County, November 18-21, 2014

15. **CEAC Board of Directors Meeting Schedule**

- a) ~~August 28, 2014~~ September 18, 2014, 2:30pm (Policy Conference)
- b) November 21, 2014, 10:00am (Annual Meeting)

Scott McGolpin adjourned the meeting at 11:13 am

---

**Attachment Two**

Treasurer's Reports

**COUNTY ENGINEERS ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA**  
**TREASURER'S REPORT: For the Period January 1, 2014 to September 3, 2014**

**BALANCE AS OF JANUARY 1, 2014** \$447,493.76

<b>INCOME</b>	<b>Estimate</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Balance</b>	
Membership Dues	\$131,250.00	\$130,500.00	(\$750.00)	
Affiliate Dues	12,000.00	12,500.00	500.00	
Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment	30,000.00	89,643.00	59,643.00	
Spring Conference Income	30,000.00	44,471.23	14,471.23	
Policy Conference Income	4,000.00	2,500.00	(1,500.00)	
Annual Meeting Income	5,000.00	7,500.00	2,500.00	
Earned Interest on Bank Accounts & Misc. Income	500.00	652.32	152.32	
CEAC Memorial Fund Transfer	6,000.00		(6,000.00)	
<b>TOTAL 2014 INCOME</b>	<b>\$218,750.00</b>	<b>\$287,766.55</b>	<b>\$69,016.55</b>	<u>\$287,766.55</u>

**TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR 2014** \$735,260.31

<b>EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>Amt. Budget</b>	<b>Amt. Exp.</b>	<b>Balance</b>	<b>Total Exp.</b>	<b>Total</b>
NACE Dues	\$8,700.00	\$8,700.00	\$0.00		
NACE Conference Sponsorship	500.00	500.00	0.00		
CSAC Service and Expense Reimbursement	141,116.00	70,558.00	70,558.00		
Newsletter Editor Service	4,200.00	2,800.00	1,400.00		
FEMA White Paper Contract	15,000.00	4,375.00	10,625.00		
Flood Control Needs Study	14,160.93		14,160.93		
LS&R Needs Assessment	244,392.87	44,894.09	199,498.78		
Centennial Anniversary and Website Update	18,929.72	8,243.01	10,686.71		
Tax Fees & Accounting	500.00	460.00	40.00		
<b>TOTAL SERVICES</b>	<b>\$447,499.52</b>	<b>\$140,530.10</b>	<b>\$306,969.42</b>	\$140,530.10	\$306,969.42

Office Supplies & Expenses	\$500.00	\$164.51	\$335.49		
Postage	500.00		500.00		
Telephone	1,000.00	262.31	737.69		
Scholarships	6,000.00	6,000.00	0.00		
Awards, Gifts	2,500.00	463.56	2,036.44		
<b>TOTAL HOUSEKEEPING</b>	<b>\$10,500.00</b>	<b>\$6,890.38</b>	<b>\$3,609.62</b>	\$6,890.38	\$3,609.62
Spring Conference Expense	10,000.00	4,331.09	5,668.91		
Policy Conference Expense	4,000.00		4,000.00		
CEAC BOD & CLODS Meeting Expense	5,000.00		5,000.00		
Annual Meeting Expense	10,000.00		10,000.00		
PWSS Reception Sponsorship	2,500.00	2,500.00	0.00		
<b>TOTAL SPECIAL FUNCTIONS</b>	<b>\$31,500.00</b>	<b>\$6,831.09</b>	<b>\$24,668.91</b>	\$6,831.09	\$24,668.91
Officers' Travel and Expense	\$20,000.00	\$7,135.60	\$12,864.40		
<b>TOTAL TRAVEL</b>	<b>\$20,000.00</b>	<b>\$7,135.60</b>	<b>\$12,864.40</b>	\$7,135.60	\$12,864.40
Travel Contingencies	\$20,000.00	\$0.00	20,000.00		
Misc. Contingencies	136,744.24	331.26	136,412.98		
<b>TOTAL CONTINGENCIES</b>	<b>\$156,744.24</b>	<b>\$331.26</b>	<b>\$156,412.98</b>	\$331.26	\$156,412.98
<b>TOTALS &amp; BALANCES</b>				\$161,718.43	\$504,525.33
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES JANUARY 1, 2014 TO DATE OF THIS REPORT</b>					<u>\$161,718.43</u>
<b>BALANCE AS OF DATE OF THIS REPORT</b>					<b>\$573,541.88</b>

---

## **Attachment Three**

White Paper: Strategy to Fund Flood Protection and Water Quality Services

September 10, 2014

To: CEAC Board of Directors  
CEAC Flood Control and Water Resources Policy Committee

From: Karen Keene, CSAC Senior Legislative Representative

RE: CEAC Flood Control and Stormwater Funding Strategy -- Action Item --  
**REVISED**

## **Background**

On Wednesday, March 26, 2014, the CEAC Flood Control and Water Resources Policy Committee discussed strategies to develop funding for flood protection and water quality services. The committee agreed that there needs to be modifications to Proposition 218 requirements so that flood control and clean water agencies can raise rates similar to a water district or wastewater district. Reducing the voter threshold to 55% doesn't work for most counties/agencies. The objective is for flood protection and clean water agencies to have utility status and an exemption to Proposition 218 requirements similar to water and wastewater.

A draft strategy (attached) was provided by Contra Costa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District for discussion. After some discussion the committee approved the strategy, formed a Subcommittee to develop a Work Plan and approved spending the unallocated funds in the Flood Control Needs Assessment account (approximately \$14,000) on activities and consultants to further the plan. These actions were referred to and approved by the CEAC Board of Directors on March 28.

Following the March CEAC meetings, CEAC and CSAC were informed of a "Reform Proposition 218" effort being led by the organization Heal the Bay (HTB). Both CEAC and CSAC were invited by HTB to participate in a roundtable dialogue to discuss the formation of a coalition of a wide range of interests to work towards reforming California's Proposition 218 in regards to stormwater and urban runoff. The roundtable meeting, which was held on July 23, was attended by representative of HTB, CSAC, CEAC, the League of California Cities, the California Building Industry Association, PPIC, Association of California Water Agencies, and the California Special Districts Association, to name a few. All of these groups seemed in general agreement that there is a need for Proposition 218 reforms and expressed an interest in joining a coalition to examine and pursue such reforms. A follow-up meeting with this group is scheduled for September 10, where a draft Action Plan will be reviewed and coalition membership will be further discussed.

## **Recommended Action**

To further determine CEAC's role and next steps in this effort, the CEAC Stormwater Funding Subcommittee held a conference call on August 28. The subcommittee discussed participation in the coalition, CEAC staff resources and funding options. Based upon this discussion, the CEAC Stormwater Funding Subcommittee is recommending that the CEAC Flood Control and Water Resources Policy Committee and CEAC Board of Directors take the following actions:

1. Approve providing technical support to CSAC as a member of the Reform Proposition 218 Coalition (Coalition).
2. Approve contract with Watershed Resources Consulting to supply staff resources to the Coalition. It is estimated that staff costs could be approximately \$5000 per month based on past expenditures. **The draft Work Plan and Scope of Work are attached.**
3. Approve Supplemental Assessment to the CEAC annual dues to raise revenue to pay for the staff resources costs
4. Amend the appropriation approved at the March 2014 meeting from \$10,000 - \$14,000.
5. Recommend that CSAC join the Coalition.

## Draft Scope of Work

### Introduction

On March 16, 2014 the County Engineers Association of California's Flood Control Policy Committee approved a Funding Strategy to modify Proposition 218 and develop a funding source for storm water/drainage infrastructure. The Policy Committee asked for a Work Plan to implement the strategy and formed a subcommittee to work on the project. On June 9, 2014, the Subcommittee approved a draft Work Plan to implement the strategy. Coincidentally, Heal the Bay had also been working on a Funding Strategy and has pulled together a coalition of various statewide organizations (Coalition) to develop an initiative to reform Proposition 218 to provide funding for storm water/drainage infrastructure (Initiative).

### Scope of Work

The County Engineers Association of California desires to provide staff resources to the Coalition as a sign of its willingness to assist in moving the Initiative forward and to ensure its positions and perspective is represented in the process.

Work Objective. To participate in and coordinate with the Coalition, in partnership with and providing technical support for the California State Association of Counties. This will involve attending meetings/conference calls and providing information to various parties to move the project forward under the direction of CSAC, CEAC, CEAC's Flood Control Policy Committee and its Funding Subcommittee. It will also involve advocating for the adopted policy positions established by CEAC and its Committees, not in the political sense, which is the purview of CSAC, but in the sense of supporting the goals and expectations of the client organization, CEAC.

### Tasks and Activities

To achieve this Work Objective, the following key tasks and activities, which is a representative but not an exhaustive list, will likely be performed.

- Briefing Papers. Information for a specific audience at a particular time on a topic of discussion
- White Papers. Information for general use on specific topics
- Talking Points. Key information prepared for delivery by a certain person or group
- Rationalizations. A specific arrangement of facts, figures and information to politically justify a position or action
- Benefits. Research, identify, and describe the benefits of a funded storm water/drainage infrastructure sector
- Interconnections. Research, identify, and describe the interconnections between storm water quality and drainage infrastructure
- Coordination. Overall coordination with Coalition members as needed, and with CSAC, CEAC, its Committees and other interested parties
- Strategic Planning. Develop strategic plans for specific tasks
- Data. Research and develop charts, maps, graphs, and spreadsheets as needed.



**Work Plan  
For  
Funding Stormwater Services  
Draft Version 1  
June 2, 2014**

The County Engineers Association of California's Flood Control and Water Resources Policy Committee discussed a draft funding strategy at their March 26, 2014 meeting. The draft strategy recommended an approach to develop funding for flood protection and water quality services, and consisted of three distinct components.

- The voters must approve a ballot measure exempting stormwater from Proposition 218 voting requirements.
- There needs to be a coalition to support a campaign that will work to ensure the ballot measure is successful.
- Legal analysis needs to be performed to identify any statutory or legislative hurdles or barriers that need to be corrected in the application of a stormwater exemption.

The Committee approved the strategy, requested the development of a Work Plan to implement the strategy and formed a Subcommittee to lead the effort.

**Work Plan Objective.** Develop an overall plan to implement the funding strategy and provide detailed activities and budget for the first phase.

The Work Plan is divided into phases and developed to achieve the objectives of the three distinct strategic components. The objective of the first component, Legislature, is to get a funding measure on the ballot for the voters to decide on. The objective of the second component, Coalition, is to build the support to influence enough legislators to pass the legislation and to mount a successful campaign for the funding measure once it is on the ballot. The objective of the third component, Legal, is to identify the implementation issues associated with having a successful outcome and a Proposition 218 exemption to raising revenue. In this Work Plan the term **Stormwater** includes both flood protection and water quality services. The following is an outline of the Work Plan by phases with each phase identifying the activities to be achieved with each strategic component. The description of tasks in the phases below is not meant to imply that all work will be strictly sequential, as it will be necessary for the work identified in some phases to be done concurrently with other phases.

**Phase 1. Identify and Build Solidarity with Partners**

Legislature. There are no specific activities identified for this strategic component in Phase 1.

Coalition. This is the heart of the first phase effort. The first phase is developing solidarity and uniform understanding amongst the project Partners towards the funding strategy and building a coalition. Building the coalition will involve outreach at three levels. The first level will be with project Partners the second level will be with project Supporters and the third level will be with Interested Parties. The term partners and supporters may not be the right terms and is used here simply to separate and distinguish between the two. Partners would generally be defined as follows:

- Entities and agencies that will receive a direct benefit from the funding strategy; for example a city or special district that will be able to establish a rate structure to fund their operations
- Entities or agencies that own or manage infrastructure or programs that provide stormwater services
- Entities or agencies that usually cannot advocate or campaign for a measure to increase stormwater funding

On the other hand, Supporters would generally be defined as follows:

- Organizations or Associations that would receive an indirect benefit from the funding strategy by furthering their mission or is compatible with their mission
- Organizations or Associations that can advocate or campaign for a stormwater funding measure
- Organizations or Associations that have the ability to raise funds to pay for a funding measure campaign

The third level of outreach would be to Interested Parties who would generally be defined as follows:

- Organizations, associations, or agencies that are interested and supportive but must stay at arm's length for political, legal, or other reasons
- Organizations, associations, or agencies that are interested because they oppose the funding strategy and desired outcome
- 

The first task is to identify potential Partners. The second task is to prepare a "one-pager" outlining the benefits of the funding strategy and the advantages of being a Partner. This will be developed based on who the potential partners are. The third task is to outreach to each of the potential partners to discuss the funding strategy and the draft Work Plan. The objective with this outreach is to determine if each potential partner wants to be a Partner, to seek constancy of purpose between the Partners, to discuss the process moving forward, and to identify their role in that process. It will be important that each Partner agree on how they will be involved, if it is actively through a subcommittee or passively through status reports, and if they will help to fund this

effort. Throughout this phase it will be important to establish political support for the funding strategy, starting with the County elected officials first (Board of Supervisors) and then with the elected officials of each Partner as they come on board. The following are some of the potential partners identified to date:

- California League of Cities
- California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA)
- California State Association of Counties (CSAC)
- Regional Council of Rural Counties (RCRC)
- Urban Counties Coalition
- Flood Control Associations (BAFPAA, CCVFCA, etc.)

Specific activities for Phase 1:

- Convene CEAC Subcommittee to identify potential partners, discuss preference on institutional structure going forward (eg., will the Subcommittee be subsumed by a new committee of Partners, will one representative of each Partner join the Subcommittee, maybe it depends on who pays?). For the purposes of this Work Plan the term "Task Force" will henceforth be used to describe the institutional structure to implement the funding strategy.
- Develop draft "one-pager" on partner benefits
- Develop a communication "one pager" with a vision, uniform message, and strategy that meets the needs of all CEAC regions and all CEAC members can agree to
- Develop a "one pager" analysis of the March 2014 PPIC report entitled "Paying for Water in California" on statewide storm water costs and investment needs and compare that to the needs of a typical County in each region of the State
- Build political support with County Boards of Supervisors
- Meet with each Partner
- Convene CEAC Subcommittee as necessary to comment and agree on "one-pager" and to discuss issues raised by Partners
- Build political support amongst the Partners

Legal. There are no specific activities identified for this component in Phase 1.

Phase 1 Estimated Timeline= six months

Phase 1 Estimated Cost = \$10,000

## **Phase 2. Develop our Message**

Legislation. There are no specific activities identified for this component in Phase 2.

Coalition. Hire a communications firm, or utilize the expertise in a Partner organization, to develop a clear, concise and convincing message. The work in this phase, developed collectively by the Partners, will help solidify the common understanding amongst the Partners of the funding strategy and will be used in the outreach effort to the Supporters and Interested Parties. This information will also be necessary as we approach the legislators for support in drafting legislation and help clarify some of the legal issues and questions that will arise in later phases. We will develop a message, clear graphical representations of our objectives, white papers, briefing papers, and one-pagers as necessary to meet the communications goals. The purpose of this information is not to be used for a funding measure campaign; that will come later and will not be developed by the Partners. The purpose of this effort is to develop a uniform and effective communication plan to talk with elected officials, Supporters, and Interested Parties. We will need data from cities and counties and special districts to develop these communication pieces and to answer the inevitable questions that will be asked. For example, Why do you need additional funding; What are you doing with the funding you currently have; What is your current shortfall and why; Why can't you live with the funds you have now.....

Specific activities for Phase 2:

- Prepare a "one pager" outlining the vision, purpose and need for developing a message and communication pieces
- Solicit, select, and execute a contract with a communications consultant or utilize the equivalent expertise and resources in a large Partner organization
- Develop communication goals
- Develop our message
- Solicit, acquire, and synthesize data from Partners
- Develop support information that reinforces our message
- Convene the Task Force as necessary to provide guidance, review and approval of work products

Legal. There are no specific activities identified for this component in phase 2.

Phase 2 Estimated Timeline = six months

Phase 2 Estimated Costs = ?

### **Phase 3. Define Funding Authority and Structure**

Legislature. Identify a legislator willing to work with the Partners to craft legislation to place a funding measure on the ballot. This will be a good test run for delivering the message and using the supporting information developed in Phase 2. Discussions with the legislator and his/her staff will provide important input and will help define any

political limitations while the Partners define their funding authority and funding structure.

Coalition. Modify the message and supporting information as necessary while working with the legislature and the legal component.

Legal. There are two primary issues to consider at this stage of the process. First, who will have the authority to develop and implement a rate structure for providing Stormwater services, and is our current authorities and statutory framework compatible with or will allow a utility type funding structure. If each City, County, and Flood Control District in the State is given the authority to create a utility, that would result in approximately 500 new utilities in California. Would the legislature support creating that many more governmental units? Could those governmental units be created within existing governmental entities such as a city or county, similar to a dependent special district (e.g. a Flood Control District with a County governing board). How would that approach meet the objective of watershed-based planning and financing of projects? How would that approach provide incentives to integration, regionalization, and consolidation? Would/should all storm water services be combined and governed under one entity, including regional drainage (flood control), local drainage, and clean water/urban runoff quality. Second, what will the rate structure look like and what processes will be used to establish the rates and to demonstrate protections sought by the public with passage of Propositions 13, 218, and 26. Formal and informal surveys of Flood Control Districts and Clean Water Programs around the state have shown that there is a multitude of ways agencies are structured to provide stormwater services. If the legislature approves a ballot measure to exempt stormwater funding from Proposition 218 voting requirements, are there other changes to state statutes that must be implemented in order to truly be a utility that can establish a rate structure. There may be general legislative changes needed that will benefit most or all Partner agencies, and there may be additional legislative changes needed for a select few. This effort will require research and input from each of the Partner organizations. It should be noted that other states such as South Carolina adopted storm water utility legislation that allows cities and counties (??) to adopt a storm water utility.

Specific activities for Phase 3:

- Prepare a "white paper" on potential legal issues and alternative funding structures, and review how other states provide storm water services.
- Solicit, select, and contract with an attorney or utilize the equivalent expertise and resources available within a large Partner organization
- Convene meetings with the Partners to discuss, consider, and agree upon a desired funding authority and structure
- Solicit, acquire, and synthesize information from the Partners to inform the discussion on authority and structure

- Convene the Task Force as necessary to provide guidance, review and approval of work products

Phase 3 Estimated Timeline = six months

Phase 3 Estimated Costs = ??

#### **Phase 4. Outreach to Supporters and Interested Parties**

Legislature. Continue to work with the Legislature on bill language and political considerations.

Coalition. Begin outreach to Interested Parties that would be supporters except for some restriction, real or perceived. Identify Interested Parties that would be beneficial in an outreach effort to specific Supporters. For example, it may be helpful to have a member from the local Regional Water Quality Control Board attend a meeting with a Supporter from the environmental community. The following are some of the potential Supporters identified to date:

- Environmental Advocacy Organizations (Environmental Defense Fund, Natural Resources Defense Council, Sierra Club, American Rivers, Bay/Delta Keepers)
- Recreation Associations and agencies
- Home Builders Associations
- Water agencies – Association of California Water Agencies
- Wastewater agencies – California Association of Sanitation Agencies
- Chambers of commerce

Likewise, the following are some of the potential Interested Parties identified so far:

- State Water Resources Control Board
- Regional Water Quality Control Boards
- State Department of Water Resources
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Environmental Protection Agency
- Ocean Protection Council
- Governor's Office
- Taxpayers Associations

There are three objectives in the outreach effort to Supporters. First, solicit support of the Partners effort to secure funding for stormwater services. Second, having secured their support, determine if they are willing to influence the Legislature to achieve the necessary votes to pass the funding measure legislation. Third, determine if they are willing to lead or participate in, and fund or raise funds for, a campaign for a successful ballot measure. The approach to and how the issue is framed will depend on each

individual Sponsor. Each Sponsor will have a self-interest that will likely need to be addressed by the Partner's plan. For example, an environmental organization may be willing to meet all of our objectives providing there is a quid pro quo that will guarantee some level of funding be spent on something of benefit to them. This may also depend upon the relationship the environmental organization has with their local flood control district or clean water program, or how they view the collective posture of flood control districts or clean water programs on a statewide basis and how much trust they have in those organizations to do what they consider to be the right thing. This will require some back-and-forth negotiation that will likely take some time. As these discussions occur throughout the state, and if it is found that there are some regional differences that cannot be resolved then the plan may have to be divided into regions.

Specific activities for Phase 4:

- Convene the Task Force to identify all Supporters and Interested Parties
- Identify which Interested Parties would pair up strategically with specific Supporters
- Develop a communication plan/approach for each Supporter meeting
- Convene Task Force as necessary to discuss issues raised by Supporters and any modifications to the Partner's plan required for their support, or choose not to accept a specific Supporters support.
- Discuss the need for regional elements of the Partner's plan should it become evident a statewide uniform approach will not work

Legal. Continue to fine tune the legal authority and structure as necessary to address some of the concerns raised by Supporters. This effort should also feed back into the language of the legislative bill so the application of a stormwater exemption from Proposition 218 voting requirements will be as seamless as possible for the most agencies.

Phase 4 Estimated Timeline = six months

Phase 4 Estimated Costs = ???

### **Phase 5. Build the Coalition**

Legislature. Continue to work with the Legislature on bill language and political considerations

Coalition. Identify which Supporters are willing to build the Coalition of support and who will lead that effort. The Supporters will need to develop the institutional structure of the Coalition and how it will operate. At this point the Partners will be transitioning out of the lead role and into an advisory role. The Partners will not be able to

participate once the Coalition begins advocacy work and campaigning for a ballot measure.

Legal. Continue to fine-tune the legal authority and structure issues as necessary.

RMA:lz

G:\Admin\Mitch\Flood Control\Stormwater Funding\Work Plan version 1. June 2, 2014.doc



---

**Attachment Four**

CEAC Affiliate Dues/Invoice



**INVOICE**

County Engineers Association of California  
 1100 K Street, Suite 101  
 Sacramento, CA 95814

**Date:** September 10, 2014

**Invoice #:** [Company Name]/2014

**Bill To:**  
 [Company Name]  
 [Primary Contact]  
 [Street Address]  
 [City, ST ZIP Code]  
 [Phone]

**Due:** 2/15/2015

*\*\* Please note any change of name or address \*\**

DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT
<b>CEAC Affiliate Membership Dues</b> For the year ending December 31, 2015	\$ 350.00
<b>TOTAL MEMBERSHIP DUES</b>	<b>\$ 350.00</b>

<b>** Optional Early Bird Sponsorship Opportunities **</b>	AMOUNT
<b>Note:</b> These are "Early Bird" sponsorships that will also be available when conference registration opens throughout the year. Different events can be sponsored at different levels i.e. Platinum Sponsor for Spring Conference, Gold Sponsor for Fall Conference, etc.	
<b>CEAC Spring Conference</b> (Joint with League of California Cities)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Platinum Sponsorship (Includes one complimentary registration)	\$ 1,750.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Gold Sponsorship (Includes one complimentary one-day registration)	\$ 1,100.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Silver Sponsorship (Recognition only)	\$ 600.00
<b>CEAC Fall Conference/Annual Meeting</b> (Joint with CSAC)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Platinum Sponsorship (Includes one complimentary registration)	\$ 1,750.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Gold Sponsorship (Includes one complimentary one-day registration)	\$ 1,100.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Silver Sponsorship (Recognition only)	\$ 600.00
<b>CEAC Policy Conference</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Sponsorship (Includes one complimentary registration)	\$ 600.00
<b>TOTAL SPONSORSHIPS</b>	

Please make check payable to **CEAC** and mail to:  
 CEAC - 1100 K Street, Suite 101, Sacramento, CA 95814  
 U.S. Taxpayer Identification Number: 23-7060404

**Questions?** Please contact:  
 Merrin Gerety - Phone: (916) 650-8118 or Email: mgerety@counties.org

***Thank you for your support of the County Engineers Association of California!***