



**Joint Public Workshop &
Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) Meeting #42**

April 3, 2013

9:00 am – 11:30 am

San Diego County Water Authority Board Room
4677 Overland Ave., San Diego CA 92123

Attendance

RAC Members

Marsi Steirer, City of San Diego
Troy Bankston, County of San Diego
Albert Lau, Padre Dam Municipal Water District (and alternate, Arne Sandvik)
Anne Bamford, Industrial Environmental Association
Bill Hunter, Santa Fe Irrigation District
Bob Kennedy, Otay Water District
Cari Dale, City of Oceanside (and alternate, Mo Lahsaie)
Dennis Bowling, Floodplain Management Association
Eric Larson, San Diego County Farm Bureau
Joey Randall for Kimberly Thorner, Olivenhain Municipal Water District
Kimberly O'Connell, UCSD Clean Water Utility
Kirk Ammerman, City of Chula Vista
Lauma Jurkevics, California Department of Water Resources (non-voting member)
Leigh Johnson, University of California Cooperative Extension (and alternate, Loretta Bates)
Ligeia Heagy for Crystal Najera, City of Vista
Linda Flournoy, Planning and Engineering for Sustainability
Mark Umphres, Helix Water District
Patrick Crais, California Landscape Contractors Association (and alternate, Lawrence O'Leary)
Robyn Badger, San Diego Zoological Society (and alternate Kelly Craig)
Toby Roy for Ken Weinberg, San Diego County Water Authority
Travis Pritchard, San Diego CoastKeeper
Ron Mosher for Jennifer Sabine, Sweetwater Authority
Jay Klopfenstein for Ron Wootton, Buena Vista Lagoon Foundation
Jack Simes, Bureau of Reclamation (non-voting members)

RWMG Staff

Jeff Pasek, City of San Diego
Goldy Thach, City of San Diego
Loisa Burton, San Diego County Water Authority

Sherilyn Hess, San Diego County Water Authority
Sheri McPherson, County of San Diego

Interested Parties to the RAC

Clay Clifton, EcoLayers
Crystal Mohr, RMC Water and Environment
Maria Mariscal, San Diego County Water Authority
Laura Carpenter, Brown and Caldwell
Roselyn Prickett, RMC Water and Environment
Sally Johnson, RMC Water and Environment
Terrell Breaux, City of San Diego

Welcome and Introductions

Ms. Marsi Steirer (chair), City of San Diego, welcomed everyone to the meeting. Introductions were made around the room.

DWR Update

Ms. Lauma Jurkevics from DWR was standing in for Mr. Eddie Pech at this meeting. She noted that Mr. Pech has been in contact with Ms. Loisa Burton, IRWM Grant Administrator regarding the IRWM grants. Ms. Jurkevics mentioned the Integrated Water Management Summit was that afternoon and that IRWM Conference was Thursday and Friday in Sacramento. DWR is holding a Strategic Plan Workshop on April 30, 2013 in Temecula, May 1, 2013 in Burbank, and May 16, 2013 in Sacramento. She mentioned the Climate Change Handbook is available online at <http://www.cocorahs.org/>, and spoke briefly about the Community Collaborative Rain Hail and Snow Network (CoCoRaHS), a binational effort by NOAA to track rainfall data using citizen scientists. Fliers for both CoCoRaHS and the Climate Change Handbook were provided.

Grant Administration

Proposition 50 and Proposition 84 – Round 1 Implementation Grant Status

Ms. Loisa Burton, San Diego County Water Authority, provided an update on the status of the Proposition 50 Implementation Grant and the Proposition 84 Implementation Grant – Round 1. She noted three amendments to Proposition 50 contracts were underway, with a fourth amendment expected. She noted that approximately 38% of the grant had been spent. Proposition 84 – Round 1 has billed approximately 30% of its grant, and is being reimbursed within 90 days. Ms. Burton noted that all LPS agreements had been sent out to project partners, and the LPS kick-off meeting was March 20, 2013. First LPS invoices and quarterly reports will be due May 15, 2013, with grant progress report and invoice due to DWR on June 15, 2013.

San Diego IRWM Plan Update

Roselyn Prickett provided an overview of the IRWM Plan Update, and presented the proposed changes for the Project Selection Process chapter and the Implementation chapter.

Project Selection Process

Visit us at www.sdirwmp.org

Ms. Prickett presented proposed changes to the project selection process as written in the IRWM Plan. The proposed changes incorporate the recommendations for the Priorities & Metrics Workgroup and the Proposition 84 – Round 2 Project Selection Workgroup. Key changes proposed for inclusion in the IRWM Plan Update include initiating project integration and selection earlier, allowing for more time to collect information on proposed projects and to solicit feedback on which projects will move forward with the selection process. Changes to the Tier 1/Tier 2 ranking system was the primary topic of discussion. Changes to this system as presented to the RAC included allowing stakeholders to comment on scoring, allowing RAC members to elevate projects from Tier 2 to Tier 1, and that the Project Selection Workgroup receives the Tier 1 list after vetting by the RAC.

Questions/Comments

Project Selection Tiering

- What does “private votes” mean?
 - *Private votes mean voting through the use of private ballots, rather than a show of hands. The idea of private votes is to make votes more objective and reduce “group-think.”*
 - It was noted that some members of the RAC like the idea of private voting, but would also like the opportunity to defend their voting. It was decided that there needs to be clarification in the language of the IRWM Plan to make it clear that this vote is a soft vote, and should be taken as recommendations.

There was extensive discussion on the ability to elevate projects from Tier 2 to Tier 1, and how the elevation and project selection process should proceed. It was suggested that the RAC be able to elevate projects, but that the Project Selection Workgroup only use the revised Tier 1 list provided to them by the RAC. There was additional debate over whether the Workgroup would be allowed to elevate projects as well. It was asked if the RAC elevation votes require the 2/3 majority the Workgroup requires? It was agreed that this would be appropriate. It was also asked if the Workgroup receives more information on the projects than the RAC does. The Workgroup and the RAC have access to the same information, but the Workgroup spends more time understanding each project in order to evaluate them, and so has a better knowledge of the projects than the RAC. It was then asked if it would be feasible to provide all the information to the RAC. Through this discussion it was pointed out that the Workgroup was selected by the RAC to do the job of selecting projects to ease the burden of RAC membership. It was further noted that the Workgroup does not have the power to move projects from Tier 1 to Tier 2, and that not all Tier 1 projects receive funding – there is further project selection, but only Tier 1 projects are considered.

There was also discussion on the scoring process. It was noted that to make the process more transparent, scores should be presented to the RAC and stakeholders before project selection. It was noted that more effort should be made to ensure all project proponents understand how to navigate the project submittal process. There was discussion on how to use the scoring beyond the initial Tier 1/Tier 2 classification. There was debate on if or how to use scores when justifying project elevation from Tier 2 to Tier 1 – some RAC members thought scores should be used to

weight projects during selection, while other RAC members noted that scores alone could reduce the diversity of projects and therefore the strength of the proposal.

Ms. Linda Flournoy made a motion to give the Workgroup the ability to elevate projects if the information they have suggests that it is valid, after the RAC provides the list of Tier 1/Tier 2 projects. Ms. Anne Bamford seconded the motion. Following further discussion, Ms. Flournoy amended the motion to allow the Workgroup to do primary voting to elevate projects, and have the RAC then review the list and have the opportunity to elevate projects to create a final Tier 1/Tier 2 list. Ms. Bamford also seconded the amended motion.

The second (amended) motion passed by a unanimous vote of the RAC. Yes – 21, No – 0.

Project Selection Interviews

Members of the Project Selection Workgroup noted that during the interview process, some presentations were a very different style from others, and that not all presentations answered all the questions. It was suggested that more information be provided to project sponsors on what the presentations should include. A standard format and template should be developed and provided to interviewees, and it should be made clear when they are answering required questions during the interview. It was also noted that the Workgroup would like the opportunity to ask more questions, as the interviews were too short for adequate questioning during previous project selection. Other RAC members asked for more time to prepare for interviews – at least 2 weeks, and not over any holidays.

Scoring Criteria (Handout 1)

Ms. Prickett presented the recommended updates to the project scoring criteria (Handout 1) and asked for feedback. Mr. Travis Pritchard asked what a direct or indirect benefit to a DAC was. A direct benefit is one that directly addresses a critical water quality or water supply need of a DAC, such as a new well, connection to sewer system, or new pumping facility constructed in a disadvantaged community serving the needs of that community. An indirect benefit to a DAC is one in which a project benefits many communities, some of which are DACs, but does not directly target a critical water supply or water quality need of a DAC.

It was noted that there continues to be confusions on what is a DAC, and it was requested that maps be made available to show where DACs are in the Region. It was asked if a map of DACs could be made at the street level as well.

There was also discussion on the integration criteria. Some members felt that integration is already captured through other scoring criteria. It was suggested that the integration criteria should be altered to specifically capture types of integration that are not already captured by other criteria.

Workgroup Criteria (Handout 2)

Ms. Prickett presented the Project Selection Workgroup's suggested criteria for Workgroup consideration. This is a table of criteria used to guide discussion of projects when considering project elevation and during final project selection. Ms. Prickett requested feedback from the RAC on the proposed changes.

It was asked what a critical water supply or water quality need of a DAC meant. DWR interprets this as a critical water supply or water *supply* quality need.

It was suggested that people consider the sustainability of the benefit when discussing project benefits. It was also suggested that because some of these criteria are already captured in the scoring process, the workgroup could consider scores while elevating projects. It was decided that scores would not necessarily capture the value of the benefit, and would bias people when considering projects. Ms. Prickett asked if the RAC caucuses should score projects based on these criteria, and it was suggested that the caucuses rank projects, rather than score them.

Implementation Chapter

Ms. Prickett presented an overview of the Implementation Chapter and the proposed priorities list as provided by the four planning studies: Regulatory Workgroup Report, Land Use Planning Study, Climate Change Planning Study, and Integrated Flood Management Planning Study. There are approximately 60 recommendations from these reports – the RAC is being requested to help refine the list into short and long term priorities. Priorities included in the Plan are those that can be expected to be completed or well established during the life of this iteration of the Plan, expected to be approximately 5 years. The RAC has therefore been requested to do the following:

- Review the list and indicate which projects or priorities their organization will be willing to support by taking the lead or ones in whose involvement would be a high priority for member agencies
- Confirm a hard commitment with their organizations (via board approval or other formal process) to take the lead on projects that they want to support
- Submit formal commitments to RMC by close of business on May 10, 2013.

Organizations which claim lead on a priority will be expected to select achievable projects. They must submit a work plan (a template and sample work plan will be provided to the RAC and made available on the IRWM website), report to the RAC on project progress in approximately 12-16 months, and complete the project within three years. Commitments will be reviewed at the June 5, 2013 RAC meeting, and additional suggestions could be discussed at that time.

Detailed instructions, along with the priorities list, are to be e-mailed out to RAC members and posted to the IRWM website.

Questions/Comments

Discussion by the RAC noted that whatever is included in the Plan requires board approval from RWMG agencies, and therefore projects or priorities to include should be those that will not prevent these agencies from rejecting the Plan update. It was noted that this activity provides opportunities for integration and coordination with other Regions, agencies, or organizations. It was noted that some of the recommendations could be incorporated as projects for inclusion in future grant proposals, and that some of the recommendations are actions already being undertaken by various RAC members' organizations, or very similar to their activities. It was also noted that the Land Use Planning Study recommendations are in ranked order from the study, and should be prioritized in that way. A suggestion was made that because of a lack of sustainable financing for the IRWM program, funding sources should be a priority for RAC members when considering their commitments.

Next Joint Public Workshop & RAC Meeting – June 5, 2013

The next joint public workshop and RAC meeting will be held on Wednesday June 5, 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:

- June 5
- August 7
- October 2
- December 4