



A Tradition of Stewardship  
A Commitment to Service

**Planning, Building and Environmental Services**

1195 Third Street, Suite 210  
Napa, CA 94559  
www.co.napa.ca.us

Main: (707) 253-4417  
Fax: (707) 253-4336

**David Morrison**  
Director

## MEMORANDUM

To:	WICC Members	From:	David Morrison, Director Planning, Building, and Environmental Services
Date:	July 28, 2022	Re:	Strategic Plan Discussion (Part 5)

### REQUESTED ACTION:

At the January 27, 2022 regular meeting, the WICC approved the following wording of the revised Mission Statement:

#### **MISSION STATEMENT (Approved)**

Watersheds are foundational to both the natural and human landscape, including the economy for all who live and work in Napa County. Among their many attributes, they replenish groundwater; support riparian habitat; supply our wells and reservoirs; filter contamination; provide recreation; influence flood plains; and play a key role in wildfire management. The WICC improves the health of Napa County’s watersheds by informing and engaging the community; coordinating with other local committees and agencies; and advising the Board of Supervisors.

At the April 28, 2022, regular meeting, the WICC completed the process of revising the Goals for the Strategic Plan as follows, and deleted the section on Roles:

#### **GOALS**

- Coordinate and facilitate watershed planning, research, and monitoring efforts among Napa County, and its cities, town, organizations, agencies, communities, and residents.
- Strengthen and expand community understanding, connections and involvement to improve the health of Napa County’s watersheds.
- Support data and science-based decision-making on topics that affect the health of Napa County’s watersheds.

For the July 28, 2022, regular meeting, the WICC may wish to review the Subgoals in the Strategic Plan for the three agreed-upon goals. If the WICC's work on the Strategic Plan is completed, then staff will return at the next regular meeting with a complete updated Strategic Plan document, for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

**SUBGOALS:**

- 1A: Support the development of watershed management and monitoring plans for Napa County's three major watersheds – Napa River, Putah Creek, and Suisun Creek.
- 1B: Serve as the local clearinghouse for groundwater resource data, mapping, and monitoring.
- 1C: Support ongoing fisheries and fish habitat monitoring of the Napa River and its tributaries.
- 1D: Share opportunities for collaboration on and funding for watershed projects and programs that benefit multiple agencies, organizations, and the community.
- 1E: Define the WICC's role in informing the community about climate change and its effects on Napa County's watershed resources.
  
- 2A: Maintain and enhance the WICC's website to educate community members with varying levels of interest and knowledge about Napa County's watersheds.
- 2B: Expand the number of users and depth of use of the WICC website.
- 2C: Expand the watershed signage program to identify and interpret the county's watersheds.
- 2D: Expand the promotion of the WICC to targeted groups to increase watershed understanding and stewardship.
- 2E: Annually identify the WICC's education and outreach priorities for the coming year.
- 2F: Expand the role of the WICC and the WICC website in local community education and student instruction.
  
- 3A: Assure that WICC Board Members are knowledgeable and well-informed spokespersons, able to effectively convey information about the WICC, its mission, and watershed health to the community.
- 3B: Provide regular updates to agencies on the WICC's current activities.
- 3C: Provide comments and recommendations to the County Board of Supervisors, as directed, on watershed related studies, reports, and legislation.

## OCTOBER 28, 2021, DISCUSSION SUMMARY

At the October 28, 2021, meeting, staff offered the following questions to refine issues raised in the first meeting, as discussion continued regarding the Mission Statement. Staff also asked about the WICC's interest in acting as the Drought and Water Shortage Task Force, which was proposed to be created by the Board of Supervisors in December, 2021. A brief summary of the discussion is provided below.

Williams: Kellie Anderson raised the issue regarding whether the WICC is advisory or whether its purpose is to receive and disseminate information. It depends on what the Board of Supervisors wants us to be. I don't know which one is the answer for sure. I think it's an appropriate role for a diverse membership such as we have to be advisory, but the Board of Supervisors needs to agree. If we're not advisory, then we have a different organizing principle, where our main role is to take information back to our respective constituents.

Gregory: I think staff is asking whether we should update the Strategic Plan and do we need a facilitator?

Dillon: The process for the last Strategic Plan update involved separate off-site meetings. It was more informal in the beginning. No one knew at that time what the WICC was supposed to do. In response to Mr. Williams' question, the WICC is both. My view is that the Board of Supervisors wants a group to be aware of emerging issues and discuss their impact on the watershed, and that can also provide advice to the Board. What the Board doesn't want is to let issues foment and reach a crescendo such as happened when we had two watershed task forces in the 1990s. This is a really important forum for everyone. We have representatives from the cities, the County, community groups. Our job is to disseminate the information we receive to our colleagues. We also have a robust newsletter for the public. I think it's both, dissemination and advice.

Graves: As a charter member, I believe the informal meeting regarding the last Strategic Plan update was held at Joseph Phelps winery. I completely agree that this group does a lot of good. I don't remember using a facilitator with the last update. We inform both our constituencies and the Board of Supervisors. Everyone here is ready to take on more responsibilities. We are not ready to take on more meetings. I support the idea of having the Drought and Water Shortage Task Force be an expanded form of the WICC, similar to the relationship between the Airport Land Use Commission and the Planning Commission.

Smithers: I joined the WICC in 2013. It was advisory then and I thought it would be great to be part of this effort. The Strategic Plan update occurred in 2015, but not at Joseph Phelps. It was mediated by us with the use of a white board. It was during this update that the WICC decided to focus on being an informational group only. We spent a lot of time on the title for the WICC. I came onto the Council thinking that it would be advisory. It's been disappointing that we haven't had much impact. A lot of work has gone into the website, but I don't know that many people visit it. We already know about all this. It feels to me that the Board of Supervisors already knows much of the

information we're facilitating. The WICC needs to deal with substantive issues. Should we be the group that takes on non-performing or dry wells or should that be the Groundwater Sustainability Agency? The GSA would know more about what is happening. I'm all for the WICC doing more than just conveying information; we're ready to address challenging matters.

Ellsworth: Going back to the previous item, the Drought and Water Shortage Task force may help to define us better and give us more substantive issues to consider. The new responsibility will get the WICC more engaged. When there are droughts, there is a need for urgent action. The local economy is massive and depends on water. We need to be nimble and stay ahead of issues before they become problems.

Graves: The Groundwater Sustainability Agency only applies to the Napa Valley Sub-basin. Does the Drought and Water Shortage Task Force have a wider geographical reach than the sub-basin?

Morrison: Yes, the Task Force is county-wide, so the Groundwater Sustainability Agency would not be an appropriate vehicle.

Christian: I can't imagine that the WICC is not advisory to the Board of Supervisors. We also disseminate information. The Board doesn't have to accept our recommendations. The act of disseminating information is advising. We are both informational and advisory.

Cottrell: This is a good conversation. We are all working through various ideas. Does the WICC really foster partnerships? The Flood Control District provided information that Ms. Comendant asked for, as an example of partnership and disseminating information. I like Mr. Christian's point about the WICC being advisory to the Board of Supervisors. We should formalize that relationship with an annual report to the Board. There are two Supervisors in attendance today. We may not need another future agenda item to discuss serving as the Drought and Water Shortage Task Force. I like the goals in the existing Strategic Plan. We support watershed health, but do not forcefully advocate. I support a broader definition of watershed to include human activity.

Ellsworth: The GSPAC recognizes the connection between groundwater and surface water. That needs to be tied in with the WICC. There is frustration in the community that the Groundwater Sustainability Plan doesn't cover everything. There is connectivity between water in the sub-basin and the upper watersheds.

Gregory: Thank you for catching me up. There seem to be three main efforts: the Groundwater Sustainability Plan, the Drought and Water Shortage Plan, and the Drought Contingency Plan. The question is how we coordinate them.

Comendant: I like the back and forth. I also like Ms. Cottrell's point about broadening the definition of watershed. Do we keep whittling away at this update one piece at a time, or do we need more meetings?

Dillon: When will we be able to meet again in person?

Morrison: Maybe in January, but we may need a larger venue to accommodate social distancing to meet in person.

Dillon: We should keep addressing portions of the update at the next meeting. When we're ready to consider the update as a whole, we should schedule a 3 to 4 hour meeting in person at the end of the process.

Comendant: That makes a lot of sense. We'll spend 30 minutes on the update at the next meeting.

## JULY 22, 2021, DISCUSSION SUMMARY

At the July 22, 2021 meeting, the discussion focused on the Mission Statement. A brief summary of the discussion is provided below.

Benvenuto: We should define watershed consistently with other agencies.

Comendant: Do we know what the current definition is? It should be defined by hydro-geologic unit.

Benvenuto: They are defined on the WICC website: Napa River, Suisun Creek, and Putah Creek. There is no definition on the webpage regarding the health of a watershed.

Christian: The watershed is different than the Groundwater Sustainability Agency.

Ellsworth: We need to take a holistic view. We can't look just at natural, have to look at development including fire risk, solid waste disposal sites, etc. We need to cross reference the natural and developed environments.

Dillon: The WICC was formed due to significant events that occurred in the 1990s to create a public forum for discussing these issues. I pushed for all cities/towns to be represented on the WICC. Since then, we've seen the Sustainability Groundwater Management Act and other additional programs. We need to keep this going in the spirit in which we started. The watershed boundaries were identified very early in the process.

Cottrell: The WICC is focused more on information sharing than on forming partnerships.

Dorenbecher: I remember the 2015 Strategic Plan. We held a water symposium and sponsored an Earth Day booth. There was a lot more public outreach. We never got around to presenting the Strategic Plan to the City and Town Councils. We did a good job on part of outreach, but not all of it. We need to plan better to outreach.

Comendant: We talked about a general outreach Power Point presentation, but that didn't happen. Our website describes assisting the Supervisors in decision making. I wonder how often that happens. We do an excellent job on providing information, but miss opportunities to provide our input. The WICC could serve as a conduit for information, analysis and developing options.

Benvenuto: Instead of fostering partnership, should we conduct outreach?

Gretchen Hayes (public): The public used to receive updates on the various regulatory programs that involved watersheds. Is there a way to expand this vision to the health of all life, including ecological issues?

Benvenuto: A healthy watershed involves everything, including wildlife and fire impacts.

Hayes (public): A lot of people don't know what a watershed is.

Benvenuto: Informing and engaging the public will improve the watershed.

Ellsworth: The watershed is a water source area. To protect water at the bottom of the watershed, we have to protect it at the top of the watershed. All stakeholders share.

Hayes (public): We need a landscape level view of ecology.

Cottrell: We need a definition of watershed in the mission statement. We also need to define the WICC's role in contrast to the GSA in the mission statement.

Ellsworth: There is an equity component. Water has a financial and economic value. We can't just look at it as a natural resource, we also have to look at the economic component.

Dorenbecher: The Resource Conservation District does so much. How can we help them to enhance their efforts and get their work accomplished?

Comendant: I look at the WICC website as a venue for getting information out to the public. We could provide analytics on the website.

Hayes (public): The watershed should support both life and the economy.

Kellie Anderson (public): I appreciate the email newsletter. It has useful links that I share on social media and is a valuable tool. In the years that the WICC has existed, you inform and advise the Board of Supervisors. When will you suggest policy updates to the Board? The WICC needs to be more than informational. The Board of Supervisors needs to hear from everyone.

Comendant: There is a gap there.

## **JANUARY 27, 2022, DISCUSSION SUMMARY**

At the January 27, 2022, meeting, the WICC completed its discussion on the Mission Statement, and began to discuss goals. A brief summary of the discussion is provided below.

Cottrell: I appreciate what staff has done with the revisions to the Mission Statement. The additions make sense. Referring to the human and natural landscape makes sense, and are areas this group is interested in. I'm in favor of the staff wording.

Ellsworth: The first sentence is really a benefit. I have two thoughts: we should reference both the economy and climate. Otherwise, it looks good.

Benvenuto: This is an improvement. The old Mission Statement was vague. I agree with Member Ellsworth. The Mission Statement needs to reference an economic component.

Dorenbecher: The additions captures mission. I'm in favor of adding language to reference the economy.

Comendant: This is a much improved version.

Christian: The economy is based on wine and tourism, including the beauty of the Napa Valley.

Smithers: I completely agree so far. Staff did a great job of describing the watershed in our County. But the economy is not just the wine industry. Issues like dry wells will affect all owners' economic situation. The economic reference in the Mission Statement should apply to everyone, not just wine and tourism.

Knight: I'm looking for language, something like: "Watersheds are important to economic vitality of the valley and human and natural landscape."

Dorenbecher: I agree with Eric Knight, but would prefer to reference the economy after the human and natural landscape.

Comendant: We have a little bit of time to discuss goals, if others are willing.

Dorenbecher: Easily answer: WICC has strengthened the community's connection to the watershed. Earth Day celebrations, booth, clean-up along the rivers, all are empowering and create those connections. I don't know that outreach necessarily defines an effective and efficient WICC Board. Community outreach including water symposium are very important.

Dillon: I don't disagree with Member Dorenbecher. Watershed forums were really beneficial to the whole community. One of the main reasons for establishing the WICC was that there were big arguments in the 1990s about the watershed and whether it was sufficiently protected, or whether more ordinances were needed. We've learned a lot over the past 20 years. One of the big changes to the WICC was to include a representative from each city and town. We've looked at the big picture of watersheds and heard about the programs being enacted. That way, we all have a better understanding of both the overall situation as well as the specific actions being taken to protect the watersheds.

Cottrell: To build on what Member Dillon was saying: Goals 2 and 3 are the top priorities. The first goal is more of a strategy on how you achieve Goals 2 and 3. We should continue to keep Goals 2 and 3. The goal should also refer to all of the communities in the County to include the participation of all cities. Being efficient and effective is an operational goal, not an aspirational goal. The same applies to funding opportunities, they fall within the other goals. Fewer words make more powerful goals.

Comendant: I agree completely with Member Cottrell.

Benvenuto: I agree 100% with Member Cottrell. We should remove the last two goals. On first goal, add at the end: "...as well as between the County, Cities and Town" to make it clear that everyone is included. On the third goal, replace "informed" with "data and science based."

Christian: Regarding the second goal, we decide what to facilitate and coordinate by advising the Board of Supervisors.

Smithers: I like the second goal a lot. We've already been doing that and have been doing it well. I'm a public member. If a key reason for our committee is to communicate to the public, I'd would appreciate more help on how to do that. We've talked about individual Committee members taking information back to the WICC, but if the public doesn't watch the meetings or get email alerts, how will they know? That should be the first goal. When are we going to start coordinating and facilitating? I don't think we've been doing that so far. It seems that most of our work is just gathering

information and putting up a website. It's great to have speakers, and if the public attends the meeting to hear the speaker, that is a success. I volunteer with various environmental groups. That is us, we should tell the public about it.

Comendant: The RCD does facilitate and coordinate. We go beyond just Napa County organizations. We can broaden this language; the word citizen can be exclusive. A better term is needed.

Dorenbecher: I suggest resident instead of citizen.

Benvenuto: We could say community instead of citizen.

Dorenbecher: We don't facilitate and coordinate actual watershed plans. We don't do research or planning for that.

Comendant: I think of those words more broadly. Is that already captured under the second goal?

### **APRIL 28, 2022, DISCUSSION SUMMARY**

At the April 28, 2022, meeting, the WICC began discussion of the goals and roles. A brief summary of the discussion is provided below.

Narvaez: We need to develop language equity in the Goals.

Comendant: I agree, that's an important point.

Benvenuto: The last two statements are not goals; they describe operations.

Cottrell: I agree with both of those suggestions. Eliminating two goals makes the remaining three goals stronger.

Smithers: In the first goal, include people who work the land but may not live locally.

Morrison: We could add language to reference people who live and work in Napa.

Cottrell: That is already covered with the reference to the economy in the Mission Statement.

Benvenuto: I agree.

Ellsworth: We need to make sure that workers are memorialized.

Smithers: Goals talk about landowners who may not live or work here, but we speak to them specifically. It'd be nice to include farmworkers and other employees.

Benvenuto: The goal should refer to community instead of landowners.

Dorenbecher: We should include a specific reference to people who work the land.

Dorenbecher: Regarding the section on Roles, does anyone have recommendations on how to evaluate member successes? None of the other boards have this kind of requirement. How do we evaluate our success?

Dillon: I don't remember discussing this before. When the WICC was established, it was the result of two intense watershed task force groups that met in the 1990s. There was a lot of tension between the two. This section may be a statement of expectations of the WICC by the Board of Supervisors. The WICC has matured since then. We can drop the sections on Roles. We need to discuss the need for roles before we measure success.

Comendant: This language is repetitive from the goals as well. I'm comfortable with dropping the section.

Narvaez: When I look at the section discussing responsibilities, it is worrisome. What does seeking funding mean? Individual actions may be uncoordinated and/or disorganized. Does this section refer to individual actions or to actions of the committee? The WICC should focus on implementing the goals.

Graves: I echo Supervisor Dillon from a historical point of view. Acrimony and discord of WTF. I was a charter member of the first class of the WICC. I vividly remember the acrimony, and the desire to wall the divisiveness off from this body. I don't think this section adds a lot. As a comment about our effectiveness, it depends on the commitment of the bodies who send us here in receiving insight from the WICC. We should all act like grown-ups and not use the WICC as a platform for our individual agendas.

Knight: I don't have the historical background, but it seems to me that the roles are redundant. Roles are guided by goals. It would be better for us to spend more time on goals and remove this section. We already operate under the Brown Act and the Fair Political Practices Commission.

Smithers: We should keep the last 3 bullet points under Roles, since they apply to individuals instead of the group.

Lauritsen: I agree that the section on Roles should be removed. We are all here because we represent different groups. None of us push our political agendas and this isn't necessary.

Benvenuto: The section on Roles doesn't belong in a strategic plan; it belongs in an employee manual.

Comendant: I concur.

Cottrell: These statements on Roles are laudable, but they don't serve a purpose in accomplishing the goals. I'm in favor of removing the section.

Pramuk: I agree to drop the section on Roles.

Knight: I support Committee Member Smithers' comments. It's important for WICC members to report back to their respective bodies. We could include language to that effect in the Goals.

Dorenbecher: Do we need a motion? I tentatively move to remove this section, subject to final document approval.

Comendant: All in favor of the motion?

Dillon: We have to take roll call votes on all questions.

Morrison: The motion was unanimously approved.