



**Joint Public Workshop &  
Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) Meeting #40**

December 5, 2012  
9:00 am – 12:00 pm  
San Diego County Water Authority Board Room  
4677 Overland Ave., San Diego CA 92123

**NOTES**

**Attendance**

---

**RAC Members**

Kathleen Flannery, County of San Diego (Chair)  
Arne Sandvik, Padre Dam Municipal Water District  
Cathy Pieroni for Marsi Steirer, City of San Diego  
Crystal Najera, City of Encinitas  
Dennis Bowling, Floodplain Management Association  
Jennifer Sabine, Sweetwater Authority  
Katie Levy, San Diego Association of Governments  
Linda Flournoy, Planning and Engineering for Sustainability  
Mark Umphres, Helix Water District  
Mike Thornton, San Elijo Joint Powers Authority  
Mo Lahsaie, City of Oceanside  
Rob Hutsel, San Diego River Park Foundation  
Toby Roy for Ken Weinberg, San Diego County Water Authority  
Travis Pritchard, San Diego CoastKeeper

**RWMG Staff**

Goldy Thach, City of San Diego  
Loisa Burton, San Diego County Water Authority  
Mark Stadler, San Diego County Water Authority  
Sheri McPherson, County of San Diego

**Interested Parties to the RAC**

Andrea Demich, City of San Diego  
Bill Pearce, City of San Diego  
Bob Kennedy, Otay Water District/Metro JPA  
Carmel Wong, City of San Diego  
Crystal Mohr, RMC Water and Environment

Dave Ahles, City of Carlsbad  
Deena Raver, County of San Diego  
Eduardo Pech, California Department of Water Resources  
Jeff Marchand, Fallbrook Public Utilities District  
Jennifer Hazard, San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board  
Joey Randall, Olivenhain Municipal Water District  
Julia Chunn-Heer, Surfrider  
Kelly Craig, San Diego Zoological Society  
Leigh Johnson, University of California Cooperative Extension  
Michelle Lande, University of California Cooperative Extension  
Joan Isaacson, Katz and Associates  
Rosalyn Prickett, RMC Water and Environment

### **Welcome and Introductions**

---

Ms. Kathleen Flannery (chair), County of San Diego, welcomed everyone to the meeting. Introductions were made around the room.

### **DWR Update**

---

Eduardo Pech, California Department of Water Resources (DWR), provided an update to the RAC. Mr. Pech noted that the final Proposal Solicitation Packages (PSPs) for Proposition 84 Implementation Grants and Proposition 1E Stormwater and Flood Grants have been released by DWR. Due to the later than anticipated release of the PSPs, the deadlines for each grant have been pushed back – the Proposition 84 Round 2 Grant Applications are now due March 29, 2013 and the Proposition 1E Grant Applications are now due February 1, 2013. DWR anticipates that funding awards for Proposition 84 will be released in October of 2013, and that funding awards for Proposition 1E will be released in August of 2013.

### **Grant Administration**

---

#### **Proposition 84 Planning Grant Status**

Ms. Loisa Burton, San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA), provided an update on the status of the Proposition 84 Planning Grant, noting that as of July 2012 approximately 20% of grant funding had been spent. Due to substantial work that has occurred since July, SDCWA anticipates that the next quarterly report and invoice to DWR will demonstrate that a significant amount of additional costs have been incurred.

#### **Proposition 84 Implementation Grant Status**

Ms. Burton noted that the Proposition 84-Round 1 grant agreement was signed by SDCWA's General Manager on December 3<sup>rd</sup>. The agreement will return to DWR for final signatures, and will likely be executed by mid-January 2013. SDCWA will provide draft agreements to the local project sponsors so that they can begin working internally on efforts to execute their individual grant contracts with SDCWA.

### **Proposition 50 Implementation Grant Status**

Ms. Burton also provided an overview on the status of the Prop 50 Implementation Grant, noting that three major amendments are currently being processed. Once one of these pending amendments (Amendment No. 5) has been processed, SDCWA will be able to close out all completed projects. To date, four projects have been completed. In addition, the Zoological Society recently submitted the first post-performance report for the *Biological Infiltration and Wetland Creation Program*. These reports will be due to DWR every year for the next ten years.

#### Questions/Comments

- When SDCWA sends out the draft LPS agreements, will they be ready to sign? In other words, are the agreements ready to be executed?
  - *No, the LPS agreements will not be considered ready for execution until SDCWA has a fully executed contract with DWR. The draft LPS agreements are being sent so that all LPS organizations can begin discussing the agreements internally, and determining the next steps that they need to complete to finalize execution within their internal organizations.*

### **Project Completion Report: City of San Diego Infiltration Pit Phase 1 – Memorial Park**

Andrea Demich, City of San Diego's Transportation and Storm Water Department, provided an overview of the Memorial Park Infiltration Pit Project, which was recently completed and received Proposition 50 Implementation Grant funding. Ms. Demich noted that the project was the City's first permanent BMP project, and therefore provided many lessons learned. She noted that specifically, onsite monitoring was very valuable in that without monitoring, the City would not have been able to accurately assess project results.

#### Questions/Comments

- Did the City consider if compaction from heavy construction equipment was a potential cause of the reduced infiltration seen in the Memorial Park Infiltration Pit Project?
  - *Yes, the City has considered this as a potential issue. In addition, the City believes that the soil monitoring that was done prior to project implementation was not adequate. This monitoring only took into consideration the top layers of soil where BMPs would be installed, and did not consider infiltration at lower depths.*

### **San Diego IRWM Plan Update**

---

Sheri McPherson, County of San Diego, provided an overview of the 2013 San Diego IRWM Plan Update. This joint Public Workshop/RAC Meeting will include a discussion of the IRWM Vision, Mission, Objectives, and Targets, which are being revised as part of the IRWM Plan Update. Ms. McPherson noted that a specific workgroup (Priorities and Metrics Workgroup) was convened to evaluate these components of the IRWM Plan. Ms. McPherson provided an overview of the IRWM Vision, which was modified by the Priorities and Metrics Workgroup for grammatical purposes, but was not modified from a content point of view.

The updated Vision is as follows:

“An integrated, balanced, and consensus-based approach to ensuring the long-term sustainability of ~~San Diego’s~~ the Region’s water supply, water quality, and natural resources.”

Questions/Comments

- Do we want the IRWM Vision to only focus on water? Suggest that the vision be expanded to consider other aspects of regional planning that are necessary to ensuring sustainability – this would include things like transportation and land use planning, etc.
  - *Those things are assumed to be included within the vision, to the extent that they impact water resources. The focus is water supply, water quality, and natural resources, but it is assumed that all factors that would impact these aspects of water management are also included in the vision.*

Ms. McPherson then provided an overview of the IRWM Mission, which was not modified by the Priorities and Metrics Workgroup. The IRWM Mission is as follows:

“To develop and implement an integrated strategy to guide the San Diego Region toward protecting, managing, and developing reliable and sustainable water resources. Through a stakeholder-driven and adaptive process, the Region can develop solutions to water-related issues and conflicts that are economically and environmentally preferable, and that provide equitable resource protection for the entire Region.”

Questions/Comments

- Again, wouldn’t it be better to expand the mission beyond specific water issues? We need to promote regional sustainability.

The RAC and members of the public discussed the following potential revisions to the IRWM Mission to take into account regional sustainability:

“To develop and implement an integrated strategy to guide the San Diego Region toward protecting, managing, and developing reliable and sustainable water resources. Through a stakeholder-driven and adaptive process, the Region can develop solutions to water-related issues and conflicts that are economically and environmentally preferable, and that provide equitable resource protection for the sustainability of the entire Region.”

Ms. McPherson then provided an overview of the IRWM Goals. There were four goals in the original IRWM Plan, and the Priorities and Metrics Workgroup discussed revising three of the four goals. The revised IRWM Goals are as follows:

1. ~~Optimize water supply~~ Improve the reliability and sustainability of regional water supplies.
2. Protect and enhance water quality.
3. ~~Provide stewardship~~ Protect and enhance of our watersheds and natural resources.
4. ~~Coordinate and integrate~~ Promote and support integrated water resource management.

Next, Ms. McPherson provided an overview of the IRWM Objectives. The Priorities and Metrics Workgroup has suggested many revisions to the IRWM Objectives. Specifically, they suggested the addition of two new objectives (A and K), and revisions to four existing objectives (B, E, G, and H).

Further, the Priorities and Metrics Workgroup has suggested that a new pass/fail rule be implemented, which would require that to be included in the San Diego IRWM Plan, all implementation projects must contribute to the attainment of Objective A, Objective B, and at least one other objective. The revised IRWM Objectives are as follows:

- A. Encourage the development of integrated solutions to address water management issues and conflicts.
- B. Maximize stakeholder/community involvement and stewardship of water resources, emphasizing education and outreach.
- C. Effectively obtain, manage, and assess water resource data and information.
- D. Further scientific and technical foundation of water management.
- E. Develop and maintain a diverse mix of water resources, encouraging their efficient use and development of local water supplies.
- F. Construct, operate, and maintain a reliable infrastructure system.
- G. Enhance natural hydrologic processes to reduce the effects of hydromodification and encourage integrated flood management. Reduce the negative effects on waterways and watershed health caused by hydromodification and flooding.
- H. Effectively reduce sources of pollutants and environmental stressors to protect and enhance human health and safety and the environment.
- I. Protect, restore, and maintain habitat and open space.
- J. Optimize water-based recreational opportunities.
- K. Effectively address climate change through adaptation or mitigation in water resource management.

Rosalyn Prickett, RMC Water and Environment (RMC), explained that in conjunction with the IRWM Objectives, there are a series of Targets and Metrics within the IRWM Plan that measure the attainment of each objective. Targets are defined as measureable and tangible actions to achieve the objectives. Metrics are defined as measurements that can be used to evaluate the actions – they may be quantitative or qualitative. The IRWM Targets and Metrics were substantially revised by the Priorities and Metrics Workgroup, and were provided to the RAC and members of the public in a handout (refer to the San Diego IRWM website to obtain a copy of the handout: <http://sdirwmp.org/regional-advisory-committee>).

#### Questions/Comments

- General:
  - Need to better-define Objective A and Objective. What water management issues and conflicts are we referring to?
  - If Objective A and Objective B are mandatory, they need to be very clear. Better defined.
  - The mandatory requirement for Objective A and Objective B is concerning. It seems potentially limiting. On the other hand, if these are broad enough that all projects will meet them, then what is the point?
  - Are we including water conservation as a “water supply”? *Yes.*

- Suggest looking beyond water management issues (Objective A, etc.) and expand to encompass broader sustainability.
- Regarding Objective E:
  - Does this objective only pertain to local water resources? If so, Target #3 pertaining to imported water does not make sense. *No.*
  - Need to include within the targets that our water supply (Colorado River) faces substantial potential threat due to Quagga mussels.
  - Target #4 and Target #5 look too similar. Also, one of these needs to clarify that groundwater issues have a lot to do with infiltration. Infiltration should be included in at least one of these targets.
  - Concerned with the wording of Target #5. We do not want to just sustain existing groundwater levels, because some groundwater basins are already overdrafted.
- Regarding Objective F:
  - Add something about soil humidity to Target #3.
  - Should expand Target #2 to include stormwater capture, not just transport.
- Regarding Objective H:
  - The language regarding the public health component is confusing. This needs to be modified for clarity.
  - Target #3: should consider more than the volume of fertilizer, need to consider the type as well (organic vs. chemical).
  - Target #3: should add solid waste – trash is just as much of a concern as pathogens, nutrients, and sediments.
  - Target #4: this target, regarding sanitary sewer overflows, seems beyond the purview of the San Diego IRWM Program.
  - Target #1: metrics for this target should include trash prevention, not just removal.
  - Regarding the comment above – do not want to lose trash removal. This is very important. Should include both prevention and removal.
  - Target #5: should be modified to reflect that we don't want to just implement LID, we want to be innovative and focus on new solutions. *This comment will be incorporated into Objective D.*
- Regarding Objective I:
  - Consider sediment and trash impacts. Add into Target #1: remove, reduce, and control sources of sediment and trash.
- Regarding Objective J:
  - Target #1: what is the difference between an underserved community and a disadvantaged community?

- *An underserved community is one that does not receive services (in this case, water/wastewater services); a disadvantaged community is one that is economically disadvantaged (<80% Statewide MHI).*
- Target #2: need to include trees and urban forests as a metric.
- Need to include interpretation/signage: not just about the quantity of recreation, but the quality.
- Need to consider factoring ADA requirements into recreation – consider adding a metric for wheelchair-accessible trails, etc.
- Regarding Objective K:
  - Suggest modifying the objective to include greenhouse gas reduction, mitigation, and adaptation.
  - Target #3: Consider removing language about “neutralizing” GHG emissions, and instead focus on reducing GHG emissions and the embedded energy in water supplies.
  - Target #3: recommend deleting the parentheses.

### **Prop 84-Round 2 Implementation Grant Opportunity**

Travis Pritchard, chair of the Proposition 84-Round 2 Project Selection Workgroup, provided an overview of activities taken by the workgroup to reach consensus on a list of recommended projects for Prop 84-Round 2 Implementation Grant funding. Mr. Pritchard noted that 36 projects were submitted to the San Diego IRWM Project Database, for a total funding request of approximately \$51 million. The workgroup had to come up with a package of projects that would sum to \$9,991,000, leaving an additional \$309,000 for grant administration (a total of \$10,300,000 is available to the San Diego Region in this round of funding). Mr. Pritchard then listed the RAC members who comprised the Project Selection Workgroup. He also explained that the workgroup was organized into five “caucuses,” including the Regional Water Management Group (RWMG), Water Retailers, Water Quality, Watershed/Natural Resources, and At-Large. The workgroup members contributed a substantial amount of time in November – five total meetings and 24 total hours – to arrive at consensus on the proposed package of projects.

Mr. Pritchard noted that the selection process included six major steps, as follows:

1. Consultant team applied RAC-approved project selection criteria to all projects. Projects were scored then grouped into “Tier 1” and “Tier 2” (top 50% and bottom 50%).
2. Workgroup evaluated Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects, and each workgroup member had the opportunity to nominate one Tier 2 project to Tier 1.
3. Workgroup evaluated Tier 1 projects, directing project-related questions to the consultant team.
4. Workgroup identified a short list of Tier 1 projects (12), which would go through interviews.
5. Workgroup conducted all-day interviews of all 12 short-listed projects.
6. Workgroup used information from the interviews, project database, and any clarifications provided by proponents to make their ultimate funding recommendation.

The workgroup did, ultimately arrive at consensus, recommending the following list of projects for Prop 84-Round 2 Implementation Grant Funding:

No.	Title	Proposed Funding Amount
496	Failsafe Potable Reuse at the Advanced Water Purification Demonstration Facility	\$2,113,000
490	Rural Disadvantaged Community (DAC) Partnership Project-Phase II	\$1,887,000
494	North San Diego County Regional Recycled Water Project (NSDCRRWP) - Phase II	\$3,452,000
513	Sustaining Healthy Tributaries to the Upper San Diego River and Protecting Local Water Supplies	\$521,000
497	Turf Replacement and Agricultural Irrigation Efficiency Program	\$538,000
188	Implementing Nutrient Management in the Santa Margarita River Watershed - Phase II	\$980,000
489	Chollas Creek Integration Project Phase II	\$500,000
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$9,991,000</b>

Rosalyn Prickett added that all projects were recommended for partial funding (i.e. a funding amount less than what was originally requested). The consultant team has checked with all project sponsors, and they will all be able to accept the awards and move forward with reduced funding awards.

Questions/Comments

- Thank you to all SDIRWM stakeholders for submitting projects – there were a lot of great projects!
- Notice that the projects seem light on the flood control aspects. Was this seen as an issue?
  - *The workgroup felt that flood control projects would be better suited to Proposition 1E grants. Please note, however, that the Chollas Creek Integration Project Phase II will have flood control benefits.*
- Were any projects that initially fell into the Tier 2 project list ultimately funded?
  - *Yes. Project 496 and Project 188 were initially included in Tier 2.*

The RAC then voted on the funding package. Prior to the vote, Mark Stadler noted that due to the RAC transition, during which many existing RAC members have decided to no longer participate on the RAC, there was not a quorum. Further, Dennis Bowling abstained from voting due to his participation in the Chollas Creek Integration Project Phase II.

- The RAC unanimously voted to accept the Project Selection Workgroup’s grant package recommendation.

**RAC Reorganization**

Cathy Pieroni, City of San Diego, provided an overview of the next steps regarding reorganization of the RAC. Ms. Pieroni noted that today the RAC will be asked to vote on the approach, and, pending RAC approval, will select members to continue on the reorganized RAC.

- The RAC unanimously approved the Selection Guidelines for RAC Members.

Rosalyn Prickett led the RAC Reorganization exercise, which included pulling names out of a hat at random. The following is a summary of the results of this exercise:

#### Continuing Members (2013-2014)

- Ken Weinberg (SDCWA)
- Marsi Steier (City of San Diego)
- Kathy Flannery (County of San Diego)
- Mark Umphres (Helix Water District)
- Cari Dale (City of Oceanside)
- Bill Hunter (Santa Fe Irrigation District)
- Anne Bamford (Industrial Environmental Association)
- Mike Thornton (San Elijo Joint Powers Authority)
- Kirk Ammerman (City of Chula Vista)
- Rob Hutsel (San Diego River Park Foundation)
- Lynne Baker (San Dieguito River Valley Conservancy)
- Linda Flournoy (Planning and Engineering for Sustainability)
- Dave Harvey (Rural Community Assistance Corporation)
- Travis Pritchard (San Diego CoastKeeper)
- Dennis Bowling (Floodplain Management Association)

#### Former RAC Members – Encouraged to Re-Apply!

- Jim Smyth (Sweetwater Authority)
- Albert Lau (Padre Dam Municipal Water District)
- Rob Roy (La Jolla Band of Luiseno Indians)
- Eric Larson (San Diego County Farm Bureau)
- Katie Levy (San Diego Association of Governments)

Toby Roy, SDCWA, provided an overview of the RAC Conflict of Interest Policy. Ms. Roy noted that this policy follows the principles but not the legal implications associated with Fair Political Practices Commission requirements.

- The RAC members unanimously agreed to adopt the RAC Conflict of Interest Policy.

#### Questions/Comments

- Can you please send out the RAC application via email?
  - *Yes. The application will be sent out to all SDIRWM stakeholders.*

#### **San Diego IRWM Workgroup Reports**

---

Rosalyn Prickett provided an overview of the IRWM Plan Update Workgroups, noting that the Land Use Workgroup, Climate Change Workgroup, and Governance and Financing Workgroup are now complete. The Regulatory Workgroup recently held its final meeting, and the Priorities and Metrics Workgroup will hold its final meeting in December 2012. As such, workgroup reports will be held

during the next RAC meeting, and will include information regarding the ultimate recommendations of each workgroup, as applicable.

### **Next Joint Public Workshop & RAC Meeting – February 6, 2013**

---

The next joint public workshop and RAC meeting will be held on Wednesday February 6, 2013 from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. at San Diego County Water Authority Board Room (4677 Overland Ave., San Diego, CA 92123).

RAC meetings to be held in 2013 are scheduled for the following dates:

- February 6
- April 3
- June 5
- August 7
- October 2
- December 4

### **Public Comments**

---

Ms. Kathleen Flannery inquired if there were any public comments. No members of the public had comments.