



**Priorities & Metrics Workgroup
Meeting No. 3**

**May 16, 2012 ○ 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
San Diego County Water Authority Training Room
4677 Overland Avenue, San Diego, CA 92123**

Draft Notes

Action items and responses to comments are presented in italics

Attendees:

Mark Stadler, SDCWA	Travis Pritchard, San Diego CoastKeeper
Dana Frieauf, SDCWA	Robert Davis, Parsons Brinckerhoff
Sheri McPherson, County of SD	Julia Chunn-Heer, Surfrider San Diego
Lynne Baker, San Dieguito Conservancy	Mark Umphres, Helix Water District
Dennis Bowling, Floodplain Management Association	Kathy Caldwell, RMC
George Adrian, City of San Diego	Crystal Mohr, RMC
Rob Hutsel, San Diego River Park Foundation	Lewis Michaelson, Katz & Associates

1. Welcome and Introductions

Lewis Michaelson welcomed the group, who did self-introductions.

2. Recap of Previous Meeting and Review of Notes

Lynne Baker and Lewis Michaelson provided an overview of the previous meeting, and the group reviewed the notes.

3. Meeting No. 3 Objectives:

Lewis Michaelson provided an overview of the current meeting objectives, including:

- Determine revisions to objectives
- Determine metrics and data for achieving objectives
- Provide preliminary direction on an integration strategy for Round 2 and Round 3 of Proposition 84 Implementation Grant funding
- Provide preliminary direction on project prioritization

4. RWMG Discussion Points Related to Priorities and Metrics Workgroup

Mark Stadler provided an overview of the RWMG revisions to the objectives, also noting that the RWMG has suggested that the Programmatic Objectives have qualitative targets, whereas the Project-level Objectives should have quantitative targets as feasible. In addition, the RWMG has approved of a schedule shift to accommodate Round 2 of Implementation Grant funding. As such, the Priorities and Metrics Workgroup will need to hold their next two meetings earlier than previously anticipated.

5. Overview of Revised Objectives

The group reviewed the revised objectives, discussing and providing comments. The discussion regarding revised objectives is provided below:

- One workgroup member noted dissatisfaction with programmatic vs. project objectives, stating that these will devalue projects that contain programmatic objectives. For example, projects with public outreach components will not score as high and will potentially not be funded. This member also expressed concern that if the programmatic objectives do not have numeric targets, they will have less value and no way to be measured.
- It was noted that the previous comment regarding project vs. program objectives is not necessarily true. The workgroup has not determined a project prioritization process, so it is too soon to say how the program vs. project objectives will affect project scoring.
- One workgroup member noted that it is possible that the project prioritization could require that projects meet all or at least one program objective.
- Workgroup members expressed concern with the RWMG suggestion to edit the word “local” to “regional” in revised Goal #1. The purpose of this wording was to emphasize development of local water supplies.
 - Workgroup agreed that the word regional could remain in Goal #1 as long as the first project-level objective is modified as follows: Develop and maintain a diverse mix of water resources, **encouraging and encourage** their efficient use **and development of local water supplies**.
- One workgroup member asked: what is the purpose of Objective A? The way that it is currently written, it focuses on outreach for the IRWM Program, and not outreach in general.
 - Other workgroup members expressed similar discomfort with the current wording, noting that general outreach and education is important.
 - One workgroup member noted that it is also important to increase awareness for the IRWM Program itself. During the Summit, stakeholders noted that many people in the region are not aware of the IRWM Program. In addition, it is important to provide support for the program so that it may continue to exist in the future.
 - The workgroup decided that Program Objective A will be reworded as such: Maximize stakeholder/community involvement and stewardship **for integrated regional water management, emphasizing, and emphasize** education and outreach ~~to promote and support the IRWM Program~~.

- One workgroup member noted discomfort with numbering of objectives. This gives the impression that the objectives are ranked with #1 being the most valuable. The workgroup decided that all objectives will have letters and not numbers.
- One workgroup member expressed concern at the loss of stewardship in the project objectives. Workgroup members agreed to amend Project Objective F as follows: Optimize water-based recreational opportunities and stewardship activities.
- The workgroup agreed to amend Project Objective C as follows: Enhance natural hydrologic processes to reduce the effects of hydromodification and encourage integrated flood management. This wording was recommended previously by the RWMG.

6. Discuss Metrics and Sources for Targets

The Workgroup was then asked to discuss metrics and targets associated with the revised objectives. The group was reminded that DWR is requiring objectives to be measurable, and that the RWMG has recommended a planning horizon of 2035 to match the planning horizons for the region's Urban Water Management Plans (UWMPs). In addition, the group was reminded that because the IRWM Plan is an umbrella planning document, the targets should consider regional goals rather than specific targets for IRWM projects. Below is a conversation related to each objective and potential metrics and data sources:

- Program Objective A: Maximize stakeholder/community involvement and stewardship for integrated regional water management, emphasizing education and outreach.
 - Consider number of community meetings or number of presentations given at meetings.
 - This is difficult, because the number of meetings does not really gauge success. Success should be gauged based on the effectiveness of meetings.
 - Need to determine if the targets should be activity-based or performance-based. The challenge is that performance-based targets are very difficult to measure unless directed research is done.
 - Note that we have three main audiences for the IRWM Program: political audiences (land use planners and politicians), IRWM project proponents/sponsors, and the community. We should focus targets specifically at these three key audiences, and the targets should be different for each.
 - Also need to consider the three pieces of the objective: support, stewardship, and outreach/education. There should be targets for each of these components.
- Project Objective A: Develop and maintain a diverse mix of water resources, encouraging their efficient use and development of local water supply.
 - Dana Frieauf provided updated values from the Water Authority's 2010 UWMP pertaining to: meeting SBx7-7 conservation targets, increasing recycled water, increasing groundwater, increasing seawater desalination, and implementing Colorado River conservation and transfer programs. The group approved of these additions.

- Mark Umphres suggested that there be targets related to indirect potable reuse (IPR) and direct potable reuse (DPR).
 - The group discussed these targets, noting that they should be vetted through the City, Padre Dam Municipal Water District, and the Helix Water District to determine if the numeric values are appropriate. In general, the workgroup was supportive of having quantitative targets for IPR, but several members suggested having qualitative targets for DPR.
- One workgroup member suggested adding support research for the viability of DPR as a qualitative target.
- One workgroup member suggested a specific target be developed for rural portions of the region (backcountry areas). This target should be something regarding metering or increasing regional infrastructure. One workgroup member suggested that these targets should be in Project Objective B.
- Workgroup suggested adding the following: support the viability of stormwater capture and reuse either within this objective or Project Objective B.
- Project Objective B: Construct, operate, and maintain a reliable infrastructure system.
 - Workgroup noted that current Target #2 is outdated, and should be removed. The region does not need more water treatment.
 - One workgroup member disagreed with the above suggestion, noting that reservoirs need treatment.
 - Suggest adding a target related to IPR since that has been added in Project Objective A.
- Project Objective C: Enhance natural hydrologic processes to reduce the effects of hydromodification and encourage integrated flood management.
 - One workgroup member noted that about half of these are obsolete, and that the targets need to be substantially modified to relate to integrated flood management.
 - Need to add something about incorporating flood benefits into other projects.
 - Note that concrete channel removal projects have stormwater, habitat, and flood control benefits. Need to capture this.
 - Suggest adding: encourage the development of projects that support both water quality and flood control or habitat benefits and flood control.
 - Suggest moving LID into Project Objective D. Note that workgroup members do not want to get rid of having an LID-related target.
 - Suggest keeping the target related to impervious surfaces, but updating the timeframe.
- Project Objective D: Effectively reduce sources of pollutants and environmental stressors to protect and enhance human health and safety and the environment.
 - Need to update TMDL-related targets to reflect the updated municipal permit.
 - Modify Target #3 to address salt and nutrient management plans.

- Suggest keeping Target #4.
- Suggest adding: implement a watershed-based stormwater treatment system.
- Project Objective E: Protect, restore, and maintain habitat and open space.
 - Note that this should include watershed-based management.
 - Question: where do these numbers come from? Suggest using SANDAG as a source.
 - Suggest keeping #3 and #4, but updating numbers.
 - In general the workgroup was comfortable with the targets for this objective, but would like to see updated numbers and sources.
- Project Objective F: Optimize water-based recreational opportunities and stewardship opportunities.
 - Add water testing for public health purposes.
 - Move some of the targets from old Objective A (now Program Objective A) to this objective.
 - Add something about stewardship at the project-level.
- Project Objective G: Effectively address climate change through adaptation or mitigation in water resource management.
 - Group decided to ask the climate change workgroup to determine appropriate targets.
 - General suggestions:
 - Implement the most cost-effective and energy efficient alternatives (projects).
 - Consider climate change implications from both an adaptation and mitigation perspective in all planning efforts.
 - Consider sea-level rise implications on water and waste water treatment.
 - Reduce embedded energy (energy required to transport and treat water) and GHG emissions (from water production and transport) by 20% by....
 - Implement most cost effective and energy efficient water supply options first.
 - Give weight/special emphasis to energy efficient water supply sources because of the nexus between water and energy.
 - Improve water agencies awareness and consideration of this growing challenge.
 - Develop standards for riparian habitat as mitigation (not just big trees).
 - Development values for habitat based offsets (this may be more appropriate under the research and technology objective).
- Program Objective B: Effectively obtain, manage, and assess water resource data and information.
 - Target #2 is good, just need to change the timeframe.
 - Edit Target #1 to align with the upcoming IRWM Project on this topic.
- Program Objective C: Further scientific and technical foundation of water management.

- Review targets to see if they have been met.
- Edit to include involvement with the Regional Board regarding the Basin Plan (reflect Triennial Review work).
- Suggest adding something about the technical foundation of IPR/DPR.
- Suggest adding something about numeric nutrient endpoints.
- Not sure if Target #4 and Target #5 are still applicable.
- Need to look at specific areas where things can be targeted.
- *Sheri McPherson to work with specific individuals to determine appropriate targets for this objective.*
- *All workgroup members to work on source documents that can be used for each of the objectives and targets. This is homework for the next workgroup meeting.*

7. Discuss Preliminary Strategy for Project Integration

Kathy Caldwell provided an overview of integration, noting its importance to both DWR and also for developing solid IRWM projects that get at the heart of IRWM planning, which is integration. To date, the region has held workshops to get all project sponsors in the room and increase integration. Now, the RWMG is requesting feedback from the workgroup on how to improve upon this existing process. The following is feedback provided by the workgroup:

- It would be good to provide a handout of information that discusses why integration is useful.
- Integrating projects is extra work for project proponents, so there needs to be a clear and definite benefit to going through this process.
- Perhaps consider additional weighting in project scoring, this would reinforce and encourage integration.
- Suggest recording and/or live streaming the project integration workshops online so that those not in attendance can still receive the information.
- Also there needs to be clear guidance and commitment for project partners. For example, people need to be made aware of requirements such as matching funds and retention held by DWR.
- There needs to be full disclosure and transparency about what being a “project partner” means.
- Use the website as a tool to advertise and explain integration. Maybe put this in the application so that each applicant reads about the benefits of integration before submitting a project to the database.

8. Begin Project Review Process Discussions

The group briefly touched on this item, noting that one of the workgroup purposes is to discuss the project review and prioritization process for subsequent rounds of grant funding. This will be the primary subject of the next workgroup meeting.

9. Summary and Action Items

See action items above. Workgroup will continue to do research regarding appropriate targets and source documents.