



**Priorities & Metrics Workgroup
Meeting No. 4**

**July 18, 2012 ○ 9:00 am - 12:00pm
San Diego County Water Authority Board 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	Sheri Miller, RCAC
Sheri McPherson, County of SD	Joey Randall, OMWD
Jeff Pasek, City of San Diego	Rosalyn Prickett, RMC
Lynne Baker, San Dieguito Conservancy	Crystal Mohr, RMC
Dennis Bowling, Floodplain Management Association	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

Vice Chair Joey Randall provided an overview of the previous meeting, and the group reviewed the notes.

3. Meeting No. 4 Objectives:

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

- Brainstorm integration strategies for Prop 84 Implementation-Rounds 2 and 3
- Review table of targets, metrics, and data for achieving objectives

4. Discuss Strategies for Project Integration

Rosalyn Prickett provided an overview on integration processes that have occurred to date for the IRWM Program, noting that looking forward, the RWMG would like the project integration process for Round 2 and Round 3 of Proposition 84 Implementation Grant funding to be more robust than in previous rounds of grant funding. As such, in

moving forward the main question for the workgroup to address is, how do we get local project sponsors (LPS) to submit more integrated projects?

The group had a discussion about potential integration strategies and actions that can be taken to increase integration. A summary of that discussion is provided below.

- How are other regions integrating projects? Are there any options besides including integration within the project prioritization process and providing points to projects that are integrated?
 - Using the project prioritization process is the main way that IRWM regions encourage integration.
- It is important to bring project sponsors together early and close to the call for projects; this will ensure that projects start out as integrated projects rather than being combined on an ad-hoc basis at the end of the process.
- Would it be possible to submit a call for project concepts before the call for projects? This would allow project concepts to be compared for potential integration possibilities before whole projects are established.
- The IRWM Region should understand any potential barriers or disincentives to integration, what are they?
 - It takes a lot of time and energy to coordinate with other partners.
 - Integration may mean reducing the amount of grant funding that each agency or organization receives.
 - Administrative costs associated with combining projects and completing grant administrative for multiple entities.
 - Integrating with other partners could mean losing some control over a project.
 - Integration makes projects more complex.
 - May have to give up some benefits or features of the original project concept to integrate with another project concept.
- Would like to keep in mind one of the recommendations of the Proposition 84 (Round 1) Project Selection Workgroup – this workgroup suggested that the RAC establish regional priorities to guide project submittal and selection. Although this is not possible for Round 2 funding, it would be good to keep this recommendation in mind for future rounds.
- What specifically is meant by integration? It needs to be clear to the LPS what is meant by integration. Suggest developing a handout or guideline document to distribute to LPS, which explains what integration is and what the benefits of integration are.
- There are four general categories of integration according to the San Diego IRWM Program:
 - i. Geographic integration – integrating across watersheds
 - ii. Institutional integration – integrating across jurisdictions or organizations
 - iii. Hydrologic cycle integration – integrating across portions of the hydrologic cycle such as upstream/downstream, groundwater/surface water, etc.
 - iv. Benefit integration – integrating across multiple IRWM benefits (IRWM objectives or resource management strategies).

- What does DWR consider for integration?
 - Project implementation (joining projects across areas).
 - Stakeholder/institutional integration.
 - Resource management strategy integration.
- Looking at the San Diego IRWM integration categories and the DWR categories, it seems as though the third SDIRWM integration category (hydrologic cycle integration) is missing.
- Suggest that the San Diego IRWM region recommends that hydrologic cycle integration be included within DWR's criteria – this is the most important integration strategy.
- When thinking about the integration strategy, it seems that integration is all about communication. If the LPS organizations do not get together and discuss project concepts, integration cannot happen.
- What are potential benefits to integration?
 - Being more competitive to receive grant funding.
 - May be more cost-effective – partners such as NGOs can provide services at a lower cost and are adept at grant writing and grant administration.
 - May be more cost effective due to cost sharing.
 - Integration reduces conflicts, which may result in streamlining for project approvals.
 - Integration may add additional expertise to a project.
 - In general, integration creates better IRWM projects.
- A motion was put forward regarding an integration strategy for the San Diego IRWM Region. The integration strategy has three main steps:
 - i. Ask stakeholders to submit project concepts – these will be brief, approximately one page. Project concept forms should include who, what, when, where, why regarding the project concepts, and should also include information about why the project is needed. LPS should also include information regarding potential integration opportunities.
 - ii. Convene an ad-hoc Integration Workgroup that will analyze the project concepts and make a recommendation regarding potential integration opportunities.
 - iii. Hold a Strategic Integration Workshop, which includes all individuals that submitted project concepts, and any interested parties. At the workshop, the technical team should explain the four definitions of integration, and any potential benefits of integration. All those who submitted project concepts will have 1-2 minutes to explain their concept to the group. NGOs or other organizations that have specific skill sets or services (water quality monitoring, etc.) will be asked to formally state their available services. The recommendation from the ad-hoc workgroup will be put forward, and groups will be organized to discuss potential integration opportunities.
- It was originally recommended that the RWMG serve as the Integration Workgroup explained in point #2 above. The RWMG replied that they would like the Priorities and Metrics Workgroup to serve as the Integration Workgroup. The Priorities and Metrics Workgroup agreed, by consensus, to serve this role.

- What will happen after the Strategic Integration Workshop?
 - Integration! A formal call for projects will occur afterwards, and hopefully folks have had a chance to get together to integrate projects.
- The Priorities and Metrics Workgroup agreed, by consensus, on the integration strategy outlined above.

5. Review IRWM Plan Objectives, Targets, and Metrics

- Rosalyn Prickett provided an overview of the handout regarding the revised IRWM Plan Objectives (specific observable outcomes), Targets (measurable and tangible actions to achieve the objectives), and Metrics (measurements that can be used to evaluate the action – may be qualitative or quantitative). During the last workgroup meeting, the workgroup discussed draft targets and metrics, but did not finalize this conversation. The draft table presented during this workgroup meeting includes the updated objectives, revised targets that include workgroup feedback, RWMG feedback, and revised versions of the 2007 targets. The draft table also includes metrics and data sources. Finally, the draft table also identifies whether the targets would apply to the IRWM Program or specific types of IRWM projects.
- The group had a discussion about the revised targets and metrics. A summary of that discussion is provided below.
 - Does it matter that there are not an equal number of targets for each objective?
 - No – the most important thing is to make sure that the targets cover all of the potential projects that could be included in the IRWM Plan.
 - The table is very clear, and will be helpful for the LPS so that they know which targets and metrics to use for their projects. Recommend trying to make the metrics less prescriptive to give flexibility to the LPS to determine how to measure their projects.
 - *Will do a cross-walk with the table after the next round of grant funding to make sure that all metrics used in IRWM projects are covered in the IRWM Plan.*
 - Suggest adding a “type of metric” column to clarify qualitative vs. qualitative metrics.
 - Suggest editing Target 1 of Objective D to: additional AFY of water conserved.
 - Suggest editing Target 1 of Objective D to: AFY of recycled water produced for beneficial uses or used.
 - Suggest editing Objective E Target 4 to: restore, protect, ~~and~~ maintain, and develop habitats that also serve a water resources management function.
 - Also suggest adding acres of functioning wetlands as a metric for this target.
 - Suggest editing Target 1 of Objective F to include volume of stormwater treated or captured as a metric.
 - Suggest editing Target 2 of Objective F to: Enhance or restore healthy hydrologic processes in the Region’s watersheds, notably reducing negative effects of impervious surfaces.

- Add metrics for acreage of transitory flood storage and acreage of functional wetlands to this target. Include recycled water and groundwater as project types.
- Suggest editing the metrics for Target 2 of Objective G to include acreage of wetland habitat and project types for flood control and habitat/open space.
- Edit Target 6 of Objective G to: Plan and implement stormwater or natural treatment systems on a watershed scale to improve water quality.
 - Add project types for flood control and habitat/open space to this target.
- How should the group contribute small-scale (wordsmithing) edits)?
 - *Workgroup to provide specific comments on the table by next Friday, July 27th.*
- The group discussed Target #1 to Objective A in detail, noting that this target addresses Goal #4, and should perhaps be elevated to a higher level (an objective). The group discussed how to reconcile issues between Objective A and Target #1. The following is what the workgroup determined, by consensus.
 - New Objective A (old Target #1): ~~Encourage the development~~ Develop of integrated solutions to address water management issues and conflicts.
 - New Objective B (old Objective A): Maximize stakeholder/community involvement and stewardship for integrated regional water management, emphasizing education and outreach.
 - Objective A will have targets associated with the four integration strategies (refer to Agenda Item #4 above).
 - Objective B will have all of the same targets and potentially others listed within old Objective A, with the exception of Target #1.
 - There should be a new target associated with partnerships.
- The group determined, by consensus that all implementation projects must contribute to revised Objective A and Objective B and at least one other objective to be considered in the IRWM Plan Update.
- A workgroup member recommended that following the formal Call for Projects, all those who submitted projects should be able to revise their projects to finalize project information (over a two-week period).

6. Public Comments

No members of the public were present at this meeting.

7. Summary and Action Items

- *Workgroup to provide specific edits to targets/metrics table by next Friday, July 27th.*
- Upcoming schedule regarding integration and the upcoming call for projects:
 - July 30-August 24: Open Call for Project Concepts
 - September 1 – October 31st: Call for Projects

- Ad-Hoc Integration Workgroup will be held the morning of September 6th. *RMC to send out an Outlook appointment.*
- Strategic Integration Workshop will be held the morning of September 12th.
- Fifth Priorities and Metrics Workgroup meeting will be held on October 17th.
- Extended “Call for Projects” to those who submitted projects to finalize project information: November 1-15.