



## **Workgroup**

### **Meeting #2 Notes**

August 23, 2007, 8:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Richard A. Reynolds Groundwater Desalination Facility  
3066 N. Second Avenue, Chula Vista, CA

#### **Attendance – Primary**

Kirk Ammerman, City of Chula Vista (Water Quality)  
Dennis Bostad, Sweetwater Authority (Water Retailers)  
Karen Franz, Coastkeeper (At-Large)  
Rob Hutsel, San Diego River Park Foundation (Natural Resources and Watersheds)  
Megan Johnson, Southern CA Wetlands Recovery Project (Natural Resources and Watersheds)  
Sheri McPherson, County of San Diego (Acting, County of San Diego)  
Rob Roy, La Jolla Band of Luiseño Indians (At-Large)  
Mark Stadler, San Diego County Water Authority (Acting, San Diego County Water Authority)  
Marsi Steirer, City of San Diego (City of San Diego)

#### **Attendance – Alternates and Consultants**

Robyn Badger, San Diego Zoological Society (At-Large)  
Greg Krzys, United States Bureau of Reclamation (Natural Resources and Watersheds)  
Jeff Pasek, City of San Diego (City of San Diego)  
Brett Kawakami, RMC Water and Environment  
Alyson Watson, RMC Water and Environment

#### **Introductions**

Ms. Alyson Watson (RMC Water and Environment) welcomed Workgroup members to their second meeting. Brief introductions were made. Nine voting members were present, representing a quorum. Three alternates were also present.

#### **Project Review Approach**

Mr. Kirk Ammerman opened the meeting.

Discussion: The meeting began with discussion on the A/B/C rating method for initial review of projects that had been initiated in the last meeting. There was concern from some Workgroup members that projects might be eliminated prematurely. Discussion revolved around the most appropriate way to proceed in reviewing the projects. Suggestions that were offered and discussed included:

- Project evaluation should be based on how well the projects relate to the Plan, i.e. how well they can accomplish Plan objectives and targets and how well they can demonstrate integration with other projects. The Workgroup needs to strive to achieve true integration where possible. It is obvious when integration is forced.

- There should be a reasonable geographic balance of projects. However, that should not prevent grouping of projects in close proximity if there are synergistic effects that can be gained.
- The Workgroup should focus strictly on the Prop 50 guidelines to select projects and develop the application proposal package.
- One potential approach to reviewing projects would be to initially focus on selecting projects that improve water supply or water supply reliability and then the select projects with water quality, habitat, and environmental benefits that best integrate with the water supply projects and contribute to improve water supply and reliability (e.g. land acquisition occurring near reservoirs).
- There should be a quantifiable method employed to rank projects to make the Workgroup recommendations defensible. A point was raised in response that the projects have already been ranked using a scoring method and the RAC is now relying on the subjective judgment of the Workgroup's accumulated experience and perspectives.
- It would be helpful to have a discussion of each project by the Workgroup before making any decisions to remove projects.
- There was a general consensus that a diverse, broad range of projects would make for a stronger application.
- There was consensus that once a process approach has been determined, the group will proceed with that approach and will not revisit the approach at the next meeting.

After consideration of possible approaches, the Workgroup settled on a process for moving forward that involved discussion of all projects individually followed by voting on whether each Workgroup member felt the projects met each of the IRWMP program preferences.

To aid discussion and facilitate comparison of similar projects, the projects were organized into the following categories: water conservation, data development, education, groundwater management, invasive plant removal, land acquisition, land management, organization staffing/administration, recycled water, reliability (non-potable), reliability (potable), stormwater management, stormwater reuse, water quality improvement (potable), and wetlands enhancement.

#### Conclusions / Actions

- The Workgroup elected not to continue with the assignment of preliminary A/B/C ratings that was initiated in Meeting # 1.
- Individual discussion of all projects will take place before removing any projects from consideration. This will allow for all perspectives to be considered and allow the shared expertise and experience of the Workgroup to aid in project evaluation. Projects will be grouped by category for discussion to allow a comparison of similar projects.
- Each Workgroup member will vote yes or no on whether they feel that five of the IRWMP Program Preference criteria listed in the Suggested Criteria for Workgroup Consideration are met by a project. This will provide a quantitative method to guide final project selection as well as provide a record of the sentiment towards individual projects. The five criteria that were voted on are:
  - 1) Support and improve local and regional water supply reliability

- 2) Contribute expeditiously and measurably to long-term attainment and maintenance of water quality standards
- 3) Eliminate or significantly reduce pollution in impaired waters and sensitive habitat areas, including ASBSs
- 4) Include safe drinking water and water quality projects that serve Disadvantaged Communities (DACs).
- 5) Addresses Environmental Justice (EJ) Concerns

The remaining Program Preference criterion – include integrated projects with multiple benefits – will be considered later.

- The cost benefit ratio of projects will be considered after the initial review of projects.
- The ability of projects to meet Plan targets will be considered after the initial review.
- Water supply will include quantity, quality, protection of groundwater, surface sources natural conveyance, and reliability.
- The status of the claimed match funding by project proponents should be checked once a draft proposal has been developed.
- A map should be produced showing how projects relate to the water supply system.

## **Project Discussion and Preliminary Categorization**

### ***Water Conservation Projects***

#### **General Points.**

Discussion: A general comment was made that it is difficult to measure the water quality benefits that are claimed by water conservation projects. Responses to general questions on water conservation were provided by Workgroup members who had subject matter expertise. The following general questions were raised regarding water conservation projects:

- Should water conservation be considered as contributing to reliable supply? *Yes.*
- What is the definition of reliability? *Reliability to a water purveyor means the ability to cover demands for statistically likely periods of drought.*
- What are the significant sectors remaining for water savings? *Landscape irrigation, agriculture and commercial/industrial/institutional.*
- Are there any differences between general types of water conservation projects that should be considered? *All types of water conservation are important and are needed.*

#### **Project #17: Implementation of Agricultural Efficiency Programs.**

Discussion: It was pointed out that the majority of agricultural users in the Region use treated water, so that most of the water conserved by agriculture can be utilized to serve potable uses. Responses to questions were provided by Mr. Mark Stadler. The following questions were raised regarding the project:

- Are all of the SDCWA water conservation projects (Projects #17, #18 and #21) part of the same program? *They address different aspects of water conservation.*

#### **Conclusions / Actions**

See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

**Project #18: Implementation of Integrated Landscape Program.**

Discussion: Responses to the following questions regarding the project were addressed by Mr. Stadler:

- How will this project reduce runoff? *One way is that the project will provide water budgets to customers, which helps avoid overuse.*
- How likely are customers to comply to achieve the claimed benefits? *Our experience is that water users comply because they want to save money and be more efficient.*

Conclusions / Actions

See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

**Project #21: Integrated Commercial/Industrial/Institutional and Residential Indoor Conservation Programs**

Discussion: The grant request of this project would be greater than the combined grant request of the agricultural and landscape water projects (Projects #17, #18 and #38), so those three projects could be implemented for less than the cost of this project. It was noted that this project also includes a partnership with SDG&E, which could create additional benefits.

Conclusions / Actions

See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

**Project #50: Water Brooms for Schools and Fast Food Restaurants.**

Discussion: This project was viewed as somewhat unique among the water conservation projects being considered. However, the Workgroup had concerns about the fact that this project would be potentially washing pollutants into storm drains.

Conclusions / Actions

The project was dropped from consideration because washing down areas is not a practice that should be encouraged.

**Project #28: Over-Irrigation Runoff/Bacteria Reduction Project.** Discussion: This project specifically targets over-irrigation due to residential landscape irrigation, which is one of the more significant opportunities for water savings. The project establishes a strong nexus between water conservation and water quality.

Conclusions / Actions

See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

### ***Data Development Projects***

#### **General Points.**

Discussion: Some Workgroup members felt that data collection should occur in conjunction with other projects and not be a stand alone activity. Responses to general questions on water conservation were provided by Workgroup members who had subject matter expertise. The following general questions were raised regarding data development projects:

- How do data development projects help to meet Program Preference criteria? *Data monitoring can guide the development of actions and projects necessary to improve and protect water quality and water supply.*
- Would the data development projects be considered studies and are there any issues with studies being included? *They would likely be considered studies. There is no prohibition on studies, however the State has expressed its preference for implementation projects.*

#### **Project #22: Joint Water Agency Natural Community Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan Initial Implementation.**

Discussion: It was noted that this project involves more than data development and is similar to Project #41. However, it was pointed out that the portion of the project that would be funded is only the data development component. Responses to questions will be requested from the project proponent. The following questions were raised regarding the project:

- The sum of the grant request (\$450K) and matching offered (\$450K) do not equal the total cost (\$600K). Which numbers are correct?
- Does the project include more than data development and management?

#### Conclusions / Actions

See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

#### **Project #25: Los Penasquitos Watershed Sediment Transport Analysis and Monitoring Project.**

Discussion: Responses to questions will be requested of the project proponent. The following question was raised regarding the project:

- Could taking sediment out of Los Penasquitos help to protect groundwater or water supply?

#### Conclusions / Actions

See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

**Project #39: San Diego Regional Water Quality and Assessment and Outreach Project.**

Discussion: Some concern was expressed that the data collected in citizen monitoring efforts does not always align with RWQCB data needs. Responses to questions were provided by Ms. Karen Franz. The following questions were raised regarding the project:

- The sum of the grant request (\$722K) and matching offered (\$247K) do not equal the total cost (\$824.5K). Which numbers are correct? *The total cost and grant request are correct. We were conservative on the matching amount.*
- What would the project monitor for? *Conductivity, turbidity, total coliform, enterococci, phosphates, nitrates, benthic macroinvertebrates, other metals/constituents upon request.*
- How would the information be disseminated? *Via public database, watershed reports, etc.*
- Can the proposal be refined to focus on areas where there is a water supply or water supply reliability issue? *Yes.*

Conclusions / Actions

See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

**Education Projects**

**General Points.**

Discussion: There was a discussion about the general effectiveness of educational components of projects. Responses to general questions on education were provided by Workgroup members who had subject matter expertise. The following general questions were raised regarding education projects:

- Are projects that target school education in DACs considered as addressing environmental justice? *It would depend if the educational outreach was targeted or just part of a general effort. Environmental justice through education would mean empowering those who lack information, and would therefore be environmental justice projects.*

**Project #12: Educational Demonstration Wetland Project.**

Discussion: Responses to questions were provided by Ms. Robyn Badger. The following questions were raised regarding the project:

- Where do the water supply savings come from? *One of the ponds that currently stores recycled water overflows. This project will save that water by retaining it in the wetlands.*
- How does the project actually get children from DACs to the Wild Animal Park (Park)? *The Park offers free admission to children from low income communities and the Park would work with teachers in DACs to encourage attendance.*
- Is the water that is currently overflowing draining into an impaired water body? *Wouldn't this be considered a treatment wetland? Waterbodies downstream are impaired (e.g. Lake Hodges), however the tributaries that the Park directly drains to are not (per*

*Mr. Jeff Pasek). The overflow water is treated, so this is mainly a runoff issue (per Ms. Badger).*

Conclusions / Actions

See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

**Action Items for Next Meeting**

---

RMC will compile the results of the voting for this meeting and send it out for the Workgroup to review prior to the next meeting. The process of discussion and voting on projects will resume at the next meeting.

The Workgroup representatives will follow up on questions for project proponents. Additionally, the Workgroup will determine if there are any Tier 2 projects that they would like to nominate for consideration in the project selection process.

**Schedule**

---

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, August 29 from 8am to 5pm at the City of San Diego's Alvarado Water Treatment Plant Training Center.