

### WEST VALLEY WATER DISTRICT 855 W. Base Line Road, Rialto, CA 92376 PH: (909) 875-1804 FAX: (909) 875-1849

## POLICY REVIEW AND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 5, 2023 - 6:00 PM

**NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** that West Valley Water District has called a meeting of the Policy Review and Oversight Committee to meet in the Administrative Conference Room, 855 W. Base Line Road, Rialto, CA 92376.

#### **BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

President Gregory Young, Chair Director Kelvin Moore

Members of the public may attend the meeting in person at 855 W. Base Line Road, Rialto, CA 92376, or you may join the meeting using Zoom by clicking this link: <a href="https://us02web.zoom.us/j/8402937790">https://us02web.zoom.us/j/8402937790</a>. Public comment may be submitted via Zoom, by telephone by calling the following number and access code: Dial: (888) 475-4499, Access Code: 840-293-7790, or via email to administration@wwwd.org.

If you require additional assistance, please contact <u>administration@wwwd.org</u>.

#### I. CALL TO ORDER

#### II. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The public may address the Board on matters within its jurisdiction. Speakers are requested to keep their comments to no more than three (3) minutes. However, the Board of Directors is prohibited by State Law to take action on items not included on the printed agenda.

#### III. DISCUSSION ITEMS

- 1. Updates to the Policy Review and Oversight Committee
- 2. Sponsorships, Scholarships & Contests Survey.

### IV. ADJOURN

#### **DECLARATION OF POSTING:**

I declare under penalty of perjury, that I am employed by the West Valley Water District and posted the foregoing Policy Review and Oversight Committee Agenda at the District Offices on November 30, 2023.

Elvia Dominguez, Board Secretary

Elvia Dominguez



## BOARD OF DIRECTORS POLICY REVIEW AND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE STAFF REPORT

DATE: December 5, 2023

TO: Policy Review and Oversight Committee FROM: William Fox, Chief Financial Officer

SUBJECT: SPONSORSHIPS, SCHOLARSHIPS & CONTESTS SURVEY

#### **BACKGROUND:**

As part of the Fiscal Year 2023-24 Annual Budget the District developed a set of financial initiatives to be addressed during the year. One of these initiatives was to assess the District's current handling of Sponsorships, Scholarships & Contests. In order to perform a thorough assessment, it was determined that a survey of other local water agencies should be conducted. A total of 21 local water agencies were solicited to participate. A total of eleven responses were received. The results have been compiled as a first step in assessing best practices, which will prove useful in formalizing the District's current practices. The survey results are an attachment to this report.

#### **DISCUSSION:**

The survey conducted covered five key areas. These areas included: 1) Agency statistical information; 2) Criteria needed to develop a framework for a policy and procedures; 3) Evaluating organizational program funding levels; 4) Development of award amounts; and 5) Eligibility to receive funding and in-kind donations.

The survey results provided validation of the value of having Sponsorships, Scholarships & Contests. Survey respondents recognized the importance of these interactions resulting in increased community involvement, leading to a greater understanding of the water industry and the importance of conservation.

The next step will be the development of a draft Policy and Procedures for discussion and review by the Policy Review and Oversight Committee. The goal is to have the Policy and Procedures forwarded to the full Board for consideration and approval.

#### **FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no fiscal impact related to this presentation. This is informational only.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff is recommending that it proceed to develop Policy and Procedures for Sponsorships, Scholarships & Contests for the Policy Review and Oversight Committee to review and comment and then to forward to the full Board for approval.

## John Thiel

John Thiel, General Manager

WF

### **ATTACHMENT(S)**:

1. Survey of Sponsorships



## **OVERVIEW**

- i West Valley Water District commissioned a survey to evaluate funding levels,
- i 21 local agencies, including West Valley Water District, were solicited.
  - Ø There were 11 responses, including WVWD.
  - Ø There were 10 districts that did not respond or chose not to participate
- i Survey topics include:
  - Ø Agency statistical information
  - Ø Criteria in developing framework for policy and procedures
  - Ø Organization funding levels
  - Ø Award amounts
  - Ø Eligibility to receive funding and in-kind donations
- Survey Conclusions
- Next Steps

### AGENCIES SOLICITED FOR THE SURVEY

Agencies that participated in the survey

Agencies that either chose not to participate or did not respond to request

### 11 Agencies:

- ü Cucamonga Valley Water Dist.
- ü East Valley Water District
- ü Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District
- ü Mesa Water District
- ü Monte Vista Water District
- ü Three Valleys Municipal Water Dist.
- ü Walnut Valley Water District
- ü Western Municipal Water District
- ü West Valley Water District
- ü Yorba Lina Water District
- ü Yucaipa Valley Water District

### 10 Agencies:

- ü East Orange County Water District
- ü Indian Wells Water District
- ü Jurupa Community Services District
- ü Las Virgenes Municipal Water District
- ü Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District
- ü Lake Arrowhead Community Service Dist.
- ü Moulton Niguel Water District
- ü Rancho California Water District
- ü Rowland Water District
- ü Rubidoux Community Services District

3

## PARTICIPATING AGENCIES

Agency Name	Agency Established	Total Population Served	Fiscal Year 2024 Budged Operating Expenses	Fiscal Year 2024 Sponsorships Budget	Fiscal Year 2024 Promotional Items Budget
Cucamonga Valley Water District	1955	200,000	90,500,000	26,825	13,500
East Valley Water District	1954	104,000	47,424,000	1,500	5,000
Elsinore Valley Municipal Water Dist.	1950	159,000	44,313,300	41,000	0
Mesa Water District	1960	110,000	36,800,000	113,000	15,000
Monte Vista Water District	1927	56,400	22,020,000	5,000	15,000
Three Valley Municipal Water District	1950	515,000	81,000,000	10,000	5,000
Walnut Valley Water District	1952	100,000	38,000,000	21,000	30,000
Western Municipal Water District	1954	995,000	166,400,000	76,000	0
West Valley Water District	1952	98,000	31,700,000	28,000	25,000
Yorba Linda Water District	1909	80,000	46,420,000	47,000	23,500
Yucaipa Valley Water District	1971	50,000	34,600,000	2,500	1,000
11 Agency Averages 11 Agency Median – For Budgets Items	1948	224,309	58,107,027	33,802 26,825	12,091 13,500

4

# ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA BEING APPLIED FOR EVALUATING COMMUNITY-BASED SPONSORSHIPS – 11 RESPONDENTS

	Eligibility Criteria Utilized By District In Selection Process	# of Respondents	%
1.	Organization must be in District's service territory	4	36%
2.	Public benefit is derived within the District's service area and fits within Mission	9	82%
3.	Promotes the building of key stakeholder and/or community relations	10	91%
4.	Creates opportunities for District visibility and interactions with customers	10	91%
5.	Garners positive attention for the District from the media	5	45%
6.	Raises public awareness on issues related to the District's mission	10	91%
7.	Builds key stakeholder and community relations to further District's mission	10	91%
8.	Promotes collaboration with regional partners as part of the District's mission	10	91%
9.	Demonstrates a nexus to water, water resource management, or conservation	7	64%
10.	Events take place within the District's immediate service area	8	73%
11.	Events take place as a regional effort with a nexus for the District's customers	8	73%
12.	Other criteria	1	9%
	Total Average Responses For Each Criteria Element	8	<b>7</b> 53%

# ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA APPLIED FOR INDUSTRY-BASED SPONSORSHIPS – 11 RESPONDENTS

	Eligibility Criteria Utilized	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
1.	Raises public awareness on issues related to the District's mission	8	73%
2.	Promotes collaboration with regional partners as part of fulfilling the District's mission	9	91%
3.	Garners positive attention for the District from the media	6	55%
	Total Average Responses By Criteria Element	8	73%

# TYPES OF RECOGNITION REQUIRED FOR PROVIDING A SPONSORSHIP – 11 RESPONDENTS

	Types of Recognition Required for Providing a Sponsorship	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
1.	Booth or table at event to distribute District information	7	64%
2.	A speaking opportunity for a District Representative	3	27%
3.	Recognition at event and/or social media	10	91%
4.	District logo on marketing materials or host's website	9	82%
5.	Letter acknowledging donation	3	27%
6.	Banner	5	45%
	Total Average Number of Responses For 11 Respondents	4	56%

7

## HOW DISTRICTS ALLOCATE BUDGETED FUNDS

	Fund Allocation Methods Applied	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
1.	Funds are budgeted at the District-wide level	11	100%
2.	Funds are budgeted solely at the Board member district level	0	0
3.	A portion of the funds are allocated District wide, and a portion are allocated by Board member district.	0	0
	Totals	11	100%

## **GROUPS NOT ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING – 11 RESPONDENTS**

	Groups Not Eligible For Funding	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
1.	For Profit Entities	6	55%
2.	Individuals	7	64%
3.	Political Groups/Campaigns	7	64%
4.	Religious Groups	6	55%
5.	Other: (Sports Groups, Political Events & One Event per year Limit per Eligible Group)	3	27%
	Total Average Responses For Each Criteria Element	6	55%

# OUTREACH ACTIVITIES THAT PROVIDE COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT – 11 RESPONDENTS

	Outreach Activities Providing  Community Involvement	Number of Respondents	% of Respondents
1.	Scholarships for high school students interested in pursuing a career in the water industry	3	27%
2.	Scholarships for college students interested in pursuing a career in the water industry	1	9%
3.	Essay contests for school students	0	0%
4.	Poster contest for elementary school kids	6	55%
	Total # of Responses to Criteria Elements	10	9%

## ACTIVITIES THAT QUALIFY FOR SPONSORSHIPS 11 RESPONDENTS

	Criteria Utilized to Determine Eligibility	# of Respondents	% of Possible Responses
1.	Water industry conferences, seminars and/or publications	10	91%
2.	Special District-related conferences, seminars and/or publications	10	91%
3.	Community events which provide a public benefit to enhance the qualify of life for residents or businesses within the District's service territory and follow the mission	10	91%
4.	Watershed clean-up efforts	6	55%
5.	Chamber of Commerce events and membership	9	82%
6.	School education programs or exhibits that are water related	10	91%
7.	Water efficiency initiatives	9	82%
8.	Water-related environmental efforts	7	64%
9.	Other criteria identified	1	10%
	Total Average Responses For Each Criteria Element	7	64%

### APPROVALS OF SPONSORSHIP REQUESTS

	Various Parties Eligible To Approve Requests	Total Reported Approving Parties
1.	Manager of Legislative Affairs	6
2.	General Manager	7
3.	Board of Directors	3
4.	Committee	1
5.	Assistant General Manager	1
To	otals	16

Total Agencies with multiple approvers 7
Total Agencies with single approver 4
Total Reporting Agencies 11

## MAXIMUM AMOUNT ANY ONE ENTITY CAN RECEIVE IN A FISCAL YEAR

	Annual Cap Limit Per Requesting Entity	Agency Limit
1.	\$250	1
2.	\$1,000	0
3.	\$5,000	1
4.	\$10,000	2
5.	No Cap Limit Established	7
To	tal Reporting Agencies	11

Note: One Agency also reported a non-monetary donation cap of 30 cases of bottled water per year per eligible requesting party.

# TYPES OF NON-MONETARY PROMOTIONAL ITEMS PROVIDED AT EVENTS – 11 RESPONDENTS

	Types of Promotional Items Provided at Events	# of Respondents
1.	Bottled water	3
2.	Pens/pencils/paper pads	10
3.	Water conservation kits	10
4.	Plant seeds	6
5.	Other: water bottles, first aid kits, tote bags, beach balls, logo materials, and stadium bags	6
	Total Average Number of Categories of Promotional Items Donated Per Respondent	3

## FREQUENCY POLICY IS REVIEWED BY BOARD

	Frequency of Policy Review	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
1.	Annually	3	27%
2.	Once every two years	2	18%
3.	Quarterly	1	9%
4.	No Established Review Schedule	5	46%
	Totals	11	100%

## SURVEY CONCLUSIONS

- Responses were received from 11 of 21 water agencies.
  - Ø There were 10 solicited agencies who opted not to participate <u>or</u> did not respond to the survey request. Nonresponsive agencies were contacted twice.
- Funding levels spent on Sponsorships and Promotional Items were similar for participating agencies:
  - Ø Annual Budgeted Sponsorships: Average = \$33,802, Median = \$26,825, West Valley Water District = \$28,000
  - Ø Annual Budgeted Promotional Items: Average = \$12,091, Median = \$13,500, West Valley = \$25,000 (2<sup>nd</sup> Highest)
- § All Districts have eligibility criteria for qualifying entities for community-based sponsorships.
  - Ø On average, Districts have 8 different eligibility criteria that can be chosen from to qualify an applicant.
- § Districts utilize 3 primary eligibility criteria for entities soliciting for industry-based sponsorships.
  - Ø 8 of the 11 (73%) of the responding agencies use one or more of the criteria to make monetary awards.
- § Districts require some form of recognition for providing a sponsorship. There were six forms of acceptable recognition identified.
  - Ø 10 out of 11 responders require one or more forms of recognition for providing a sponsorship.
- § All 11 respondents identified that budgeting and funds allotment is done on a District wide basis. There are no funds specifically allocated to a district or individual Board members.

16

## SURVEY CONCLUSIONS

- Receiving District funding is limited to certain qualified entities. Examples of ineligible groups would be Political Groups, Religious Groups, and individuals.
  - Ø All 11 respondents identified different entities that are not eligible for funding. On average, each respondent had 6 types of entities that are not eligible for funding.
- 10 out of the 11 respondents recognize the importance of community involvement by having student scholarships, essay contests, and poster contests.
- 10 out of the 11 respondents have eligibility criteria for type of activities that qualify for sponsorships. The top 4 activities are:
  - Ø Water industry conferences, seminars and/or publications
  - Ø Special District related conferences, seminars and/or publications
  - Ø Community events that provide public benefit within the District's territory
  - Ø School education programs or exhibits that are water related
- Each District handled approval requests from requesting parties differently. The most common approach was approval by the General Manager in 7 out of 11 agencies (64%)
- The annual amount any one entity could receive per year varied from as low as \$250 up to \$10,000.
  - Ø 7 out of 11 agencies that do not have a set cap limit.

## SURVEY CONCLUSIONS

- Promotional items are donated at events by 10 out of the 11 responding agencies. Agencies provided multiple types of promotional items. The three most reported types of items are:
  - Ø 10 Agencies Pens/pencil/paper pads
  - Ø 10 Agencies Water conservation kits
  - Ø 6 Agencies plant seeds
- Policy review of sponsorships and donations by the Board of Directors varied.
  - Ø 5 out of 11 Districts have no established policy review schedule
  - Ø 3 out of 11 Districts review the policy annually
  - Ø 2 out of 11 District review it once every two years
- All 11 Districts had a framework for the handling of sponsorships and donations. Each recognized that sponsorships and donations are an important component in customer awareness and education.
- The survey results will be valuable in updating existing practices at West Valley Water District. The help from other Districts is very much appreciated. Thank you.

## **NEXT STEPS**

- Survey results will be shared with the Policy Committee for input and comment.
- i Policy/Procedures will be developed for Policy Committee review and comment and to forward to the full Board for consideration and approval.
- Guidelines and application form will be placed on the District's website for interested parties to pursue a funding opportunity.