



**Regional Advisory Committee
Meeting #37 Notes**

May 30, 2012, 9 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
San Diego County Water Authority
4677 Overland Ave., San Diego CA 92123

Attendance

RAC Members

Kathy Flannery, County of San Diego (chair)
Anne Bamford, Industrial Environment Association
Arne Sandvik, Padre Dam Municipal Water District
Bill Hunter, Santa Fe Irrigation District
Cathy Pieroni for Marsi Steirer, City of San Diego
Dennis Bowling, Floodplain Management Association (and alternate, Iovanka Todt)
Denise Landstedt, Rancho California Water District representing the Upper Santa Margarita Watershed IRWM Region
Doug Gibson, San Elijo Lagoon Conservancy
Eric Larson, Farm Bureau San Diego County
Jack Simes, United States Bureau of Reclamation
Judy Mitchell, Mission Resources Conservation District
Kirk Ammerman, City of Chula Vista
Linda Flournoy, Planning and Engineering for Sustainability
Lynne Baker, San Dieguito River Valley Conservancy
Mark Umphres, Helix Water District
Mo Lahsaie, City of Oceanside
Rob Hutsel, San Diego River Park Foundation
Ron Mosher, Sweetwater Authority
Toby Roy for Ken Weinberg, San Diego County Water Authority

RWVG Staff

Jeff Pasek, City of San Diego
Sheri McPherson, County of San Diego
Stephanie Gaines, County of San Diego
Mark Stadler, San Diego County Water Authority
Loisa Burton, San Diego County Water Authority

Interested Parties to the RAC

Adam Hoch, Hoch Consulting
Alyson Watson, RMC Water and Environment
Ann Van Leer, Land Conservation Brokerage
Anthony Chadwick, City of San Diego
Crystal Mohr, RMC Water and Environment
Don Schumacher, San Diego Country Estates Association
Eddie Pech, Department of Water Resources
Ernest Garrett, San Diego Country Estates Association
Jack Bebee, Fallbrook Public Utilities District
Joseph Randall, Olivenhain Municipal Water District
Julie Sands, City of San Diego
Laura Carpenter, Brown and Caldwell
Maria Mariscal, San Diego County Water Authority
Michael Drennan, Weston Solutions
Mindy Fogg, County of San Diego
Robyn Badger, San Diego Zoological Society
Rosalyn Prickett, RMC Water and Environment

Introductions

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

DWR Update

Mr. Eddie Pech, California Department of Water Resources (DWR) provided an update on items of note from DWR. Mr. Pech noted that the Local Groundwater Assistance (LGA) grant Project Solicitation Package was available on May 2nd, and grants are due on July 13th. DWR will be holding workshops in June on the LGA program, and there will be a workshop in Riverside on Jun 11th at the California Towers Building.

Ms. Cathleen Pieroni, City of San Diego added that there has been news that the Water Bond will not be on the 2012 ballot. Currently, the State is discussing if the Water Bond will need to be amended to be placed on the ballot at a later date. The State is also discussing if this amendment will require a 1/2 or 2/3 majority vote from the State Legislature.

Prop 50 Workgroup Update

Mr. Kirk Ammerman, City of Chula Vista, provided an overview of the outcomes from the Proposition 50 Project Selection Workgroup. Mr. Ammerman reminded the RAC that at the last RAC meeting (held April 4th), the RAC voted to reconvene the Proposition (Prop) 50 Project Selection Workgroup to determine how to redistribute approximately \$2.5 million in funding from a Helix Water District project that is unable to move forward. The original Helix Water District project would reduce dependence on imported water and provide ecosystem restoration benefits. As such, the redistributed Prop 50 funding must provide funds to impart the same

benefits. On April 4th, the RAC provided the following guidance to the workgroup for consideration in redistributing the Prop 50 funds:

- All open projects in the Prop 50 grant package are eligible to apply for funding;
- No limit on amount of funds a project may apply for, up to the maximum;
- Priority given to projects in the Local Supply Protection and Development Category; and
- No additional local match is required.

In addition, the workgroup had the following guidance from DWR:

- Only projects within the Prop 50 grant package are eligible;
- Funding cannot go to completed projects;
- Projects must help to achieve the same goal or goals as the original project; and
- Cannot reimburse for dollars already spent.

In sum, the workgroup met two times to evaluate all submitted projects (8 total) in accordance with the original goals of the Helix Water District Project, RAC, and DWR guidance, and also considering that both the RAC and DWR would like the amended project(s) to provide added value with the additional funding. The workgroup unanimously agreed to propose funding redistribution as follows:

- Project #6 (Recycled Water Distribution System Expansion, Parklands Retrofit & Indirect Potable Reuse/Reservoir Augmentation), which is a City of San Diego project is to receive \$1,477,119.08 to fund installation of 2,500 feet of new pipeline for the reuse of an additional 1,000 acre-feet of water per year (AFY). In addition, funding for this project will be used to extend operation of the City's Advanced Water Purification Facility (demonstration facility) to test online monitoring and advanced treatment barriers for potable reuse purposes. The outcomes of the City's demonstration facility will set the framework for up to 90,000 AFY of new local water supply through potable reuse.
- Project #8 (El Capitan Reservoir Watershed Acquisition & Restoration), which is a San Diego River Park Foundation project is to receive \$855,000 to acquire, preserve, and restore 152 acres of upland habitat that provides a critical source water protection buffer for the El Capitan Reservoir.
- Project #9 (Northern San Diego County Invasive Non-Native Species Control), which is a Mission Resources Conservation District project is to receive \$250,000 to restore habitat through control of invasive non-native plant species in multiple North County hydrologic units.

Given the overall benefits that would be provided by the funding redistribution package, the workgroup believes this is a strong package to submit to DWR for funding redistribution.

Following Kirk Ammerman's presentation regarding the Proposition 50 Project Selection Workgroup's recommendation, Mr. Ammerman asked if any members of the RAC had questions or comments. The RAC did not have any questions or comments, and unanimously voted to approve the workgroup's recommendation.

Grant Administration

Implementation Grant Status

Ms. Loisa Burton, San Diego County Water Authority (CWA), explained that there are currently four major amendments being processed for projects receiving Prop 50 implementation grant funding. Ms. Burton also noted that there are two minor amendments related to Prop 50 implementation grant projects. In sum, Ms. Burton noted that while many of the Prop 50 projects have not yet billed for substantial amounts of grant funds, many of the projects are in the process of expending matching funds. In addition, once various amendments are approved by DWR, these projects will continue to progress and expend grant funding.

With regards to the Prop 84 implementation grants, CWA is in the process of working with DWR to finalize and formally execute the grant agreement. Once this occurs, CWA will execute individual contracts with each of the local project sponsors.

Planning Grant Status

Ms. Burton also explained that CWA submitted the first IRWM Plan Update (Prop 84 Planning Grant) invoice and progress report in April of 2012. This invoice and progress report contained matching funds, and CWA is currently working on processing another invoice with reimbursable costs.

Questions/Comments

- When does CWA expect final execution of the Prop 84 Implementation Grant contract with DWR?
 - *CWA is submitting comments to DWR today, and expects final execution within the next month or month and a half.*
- How does this process relate to timing for local project sponsors? Does CWA staff need to have the final contract approved by the CWA Board before local project sponsors can receive executed contracts?
 - *The CWA Board already approved of the final contract in a prior resolution, so the executed contract does not need board approval.*

San Diego IRWM Plan Update

Workgroup Reports

Ms. Alyson Watson, RMC Water and Environment, provided an overview to the group regarding the current status of the IRWM Plan Update. Ms. Watson noted that there are six workgroups that will provide input directly into the IRWM Plan Update, and four of these are currently in the process of meeting. Each workgroup has a designated Chair, and each Chair will provide an overview to the RAC on the progress of each workgroup to date. These progress reports are provided below.

Mr. Kirk Ammerman provided an overview of the Governance and Financing Workgroup, noting that this workgroup has met two times to date and has a total of four meetings through August of 2012. Mr. Ammerman explained that during the first meeting, the workgroup established

governance rules for the rest of the IRWM Plan Update workgroups regarding consensus, establishment of a Chair and Vice Chair, and expectations for workgroup members. During the second meeting the workgroup focused on discussing the RAC and on establishing formal rules for the makeup of the RAC, terms for RAC members, and membership policies. The group will continue to determine responsibilities, membership, and other RAC criteria during their next meeting. Mr. Mark Stadler, CWA, added an explanation for why the RAC is such a large part of this workgroup's discussion. He noted that the RAC was originally asked to meet for approximately five meetings, and they are currently on meeting #37. As such, it is necessary to formalize this process and ensure that RAC members are aware of the policies and expectations, and that there is a formal process for adding and replacing members.

Ms. Lynne Baker, San Dieguito River Valley Conservancy, provided an overview of the Priorities and Plan Metrics Workgroup. Ms. Baker noted that this group has met three times, and will meet two additional times between now and October 2012. Ms. Baker explained that the workgroup has worked on modifying the vision, mission, goals, and objectives from the 2007 IRWM Plan. At their last meeting, the workgroup focused on updating the targets for each objective. Ms. Baker noted that the workgroup is interested in gathering additional sources of information to use in target-setting, and that if any members of the RAC or other interested parties have potential sources of information to recommend for this exercise, they can send them to Rosalyn Prickett (rprickett@rmcwater.com) or Mark Stadler (MStadler@sdcwa.org).

Ms. Iovanka Todt, Floodplain Management Association, provided an overview of the Regulatory Workgroup. Ms. Todt noted that this group has met three times, with the last meeting occurring the previous day (May 29th). This group is focused on providing input to the IRWM Plan Update regarding opportunities for collaboration between the San Diego IRWM Program and the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Board). Ms. Todt noted that membership for this workgroup is very diverse, which has led to robust discussions and interesting feedback. Ms. Todt then provided an overview of workgroup input, noting that the workgroup has preliminarily determined that the following areas provide potential for collaboration between the IRWM Program and the Regional Board: communication, public involvement, regional planning, water quality standards, restoration and mitigation, and data. Ms. Todt noted that brainstorming on collaboration areas is now complete, and the group is working to prioritize these areas and develop an outline for the final report that will be incorporated into the IRWM Plan Update.

Ms. Sheri McPherson, County of San Diego, provided an overview of the Land Use Planning Workshop. Ms. McPherson noted that this group differs slightly from the other previously described groups in that it is a workshop rather than a workgroup. The first workshop has been held, and contained a mix of water managers and land use planners. During the workshop there was a focus on discussing areas where communication and planning can be improved between water managers and land use planners to improve water resources planning efforts. The next step in this process is to produce a draft guidance document for improved coordination between land use and water management planning, which will be reviewed at the second and final workshop.

Ms. Alyson Watson provided a brief overview of the Integrated Flood Forum and the Climate Change Workgroup, which have not yet commenced. The first Integrated Flood Forum will be held on Tuesday June 26th from 1:30-4:00 p.m. at the San Diego County Water Authority. The first Climate Change Workgroup will be held in late June or early July of 2012.

Questions/Comments

- Suggest that with respect to target-setting for the Program and Priorities Workgroup, the group should contact the San Diego Regional Sustainability Partnership. This group recently convened a Task Force that spent over two years gleaning information from available data sources to develop relevant targets.

Watershed Workshop Approach

Ms. Alyson Watson provided an overview of the watershed workshops, noting that these will be convened as part of the IRWM Plan Update. The purpose is to hold public workshops at the watershed-scale to identify issues as they relate to watersheds throughout the Region. In total, there will be four total watershed workshops, which presents a slight issue because there are eleven total watersheds in the San Diego IRWM Region. As such, the Regional Water Management Group (RWMG) has recommended grouping the Region's watersheds as follows:

- San Juan, Santa Margarita, and San Luis Rey;
- Carlsbad and San Dieguito;
- Peñaquitos, La Jolla, Mission Bay and the San Diego River;
- Pueblo, Sweetwater, Otay, and Tijuana

Ms. Watson noted that the RWMG is looking for feedback on the watershed workshop approach.

Questions/Comments

- How does this division line up with the existing division of Stormwater Co-Permittees who already have designated committees and subgroups?
 - *The RWMG considered Co-Permittee groupings when establishing the four watershed workgroups. As such, these workgroups already align with the Co-Permittee divisions.*
- Is the plan to contact interested parties in each of these watershed areas and present to them on IRWM-related topics at their meetings?
 - *No, the idea is that these will be separate standalone workshops as part of the IRWM Plan Update. We will coordinate with stakeholders in each of the watershed areas, but will not necessarily hold workshops at the same time as their existing meetings.*
- This is a good opportunity to engage with land use folks in each of the watersheds. Suggest reaching out to them.
- Comment to the RAC to please inform any interested parties of these workshops, as the RWMG is looking for broad attendance.
- Comment that this is coming up shortly if there are going to be workshops in July, need to have dates set so that the RAC can get the word out to stakeholders.

San Diego Region Updates

Stormwater Permit Update

Ms. Sheri McPherson provided an overview of the new San Diego Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System Permit (Regional MS4 Permit), which will be issued to municipal Co-permittees in San Diego County, Southern Orange County, and Riverside County by the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Board). This permit is currently in administrative draft form, and the draft was released in April 2012. The Regional Board is currently holding public workshops to discuss the Regional MS4 Permit, and is anticipating adopting the revised permit by the end of 2012.

Ms. McPherson noted that the schedule is quite ambitious, as this permit is extensive and has substantial changes from the previous permit. Ms. McPherson noted that the new permit will be regional in nature (across all of Region 9 of the Regional Board), and will focus on watershed-scale planning, adaptive management, and achieving outcomes. This permit covers all of the watersheds in Region 9 under one permit rather than issuing permits on a County-by-County basis as was done previously. As such, San Diego County, Southern Orange County, and Riverside County will all be covered by the same permit once each County's existing permit expires.

One notable feature of the new permit is that it focuses on adaptive management that contains the following steps:

1. Plan: Establish priorities, targets, outcomes, and schedules;
2. Implement: Implement necessary strategies to meet goals established under Step 1;
3. Monitor: Monitor water quality and established outcome indicators to determine effectiveness of implementation strategies;
4. Assess: Use monitoring information to determine if the planning targets established under Step 1 and relative implementation strategies are appropriate;
5. Repeat: Re-visit Step 1 to modify the priorities, targets, outcomes, and schedules as necessary based on the results of Step 4.

Ms. McPherson noted that the permit is currently an administrative draft, and the Regional Board is holding focused meetings to discuss the draft permit and its content. Further steps include presenting a tentative order and draft permit to stakeholders, holding public workshops, then adopting a permit and executing an order. The County and Co-permittees will continue to update the RAC regarding this process, and can provide further presentations as necessary.

Bacteria TMDL Implementation Plan

Ms. Stephanie Gaines, County of San Diego, then provided an update regarding the region's Bacteria Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Implementation Plans. Ms. Gaines notes that TMDLs are established for all impaired water bodies listed on the 303(d) list, are issued by the Regional Board, and are meant to identify the maximum amount of pollutants that can enter a given water body and still achieve applicable water quality standards.

TMDL Implementation Plans are established for various pollutants, and identify pollutants, loading targets, and load allocations for specific water bodies. Currently, several municipalities and water bodies in the Region are working to meet Resolution R9-2010-0001 of the Regional Board by submitting Bacteria TMDL Implementation Plans to the Regional Board for relevant beaches and creeks. The Bacteria TMDL Implementation Plans can be either Bacteria Load Reduction Plans (BLRPS, just for bacteria) or Combined Load Reduction Plans (CLRPs, which address multiple pollutants).

Ms. Gaines noted that several municipalities, including the County of San Diego, are in the process of developing CLRPs. In general, CLRPs are broad and flexible with non-structural (behavior-based) and structural (best management practices, etc.) and focus on compliance monitoring. The current issue is that municipalities are also working on developing a new version of the Regional MS4 Permit (see discussion above). As such, municipalities are working to find a way to reconcile the highly structural and target-based MS4 Permit requirements with the flexible and broad CLRP requirements. In addition, many municipalities are struggling to find a way to pay for TMDL implementation, which is highly costly (generally many millions of dollars). As the Region's municipalities move forward in adopting both the MS4 Permit and various CLRPs, they will continue to strive to find a way to reconcile both of these water quality planning processes.

Due to the nature of interest in this topic, Ms. Kathy Flannery inquired if the RAC would be interested in hearing more about this issue and such things as the science behind regulatory requirements for the MS4 Permit and TMDL Implementation Plans. The RAC indicated agreement and interest in continuing these discussions in the future.

Questions/Comments

- How does the Regional Board determine if the TMDL Implementation Plans are effective? The goal of these plans is to reach water quality parameters that are established to improve public health – does the Regional Board do research to determine if these plans are assisting in the goal of improving human health?
 - *Agree that there is a disconnect between the implementation plans and the issue (water quality goals) that they are managing to.*
- Perhaps the RAC could work to determine special studies and projects that would help with implementation of the CLRPs. For example, it would be highly helpful to complete bacteria source identification studies to determine relevant sources of pollutants. In addition, there is also a need to determine the natural background levels of pollutants such as bacteria in the environment.
- Is the Regional Board looking at re-evaluating water bodies on the 303(d) list? The impaired state of some water bodies on the 303(d) list is not necessarily supported by data, and should probably be revisited before the Region spends millions and millions of dollars to create and implement TMDL Implementation Plans.
 - *Some water bodies have been taken off of the 303(d) list, although this is a long and difficult process.*

- With regards to the new Municipal MS4 Permit – do the numeric targets represent goals that the Region will strive to reach, or do they represent strict numerical limits?
 - *The Regional Board has indicated that they intend for the former, where the numeric targets are goals rather than strict limits. One of the suggestions that the County is making to the Regional Board is to change wording of the permit to ensure that this point is clear.*
- Suggest broadening awareness on the bigger picture level. Instead of focusing on singular and structural solutions, we should focus on looking at the system holistically and determining ways that the environment and habitats themselves can be improved or used to address water quality concerns.

Next RAC Meeting

The next RAC meeting will be held on Wednesday August 1, 2012 from 9:00am to 11:30am at San Diego County Water Authority Board Room (4677 Overland Ave., San Diego, CA 92123).

RAC meetings to be held in 2012 are scheduled for the following dates:

- October 3, 2012, and
- December 5, 2012.

Public Comments

Ms. Kathy Flannery inquired if there were any public comments.

- Mr. Jack Simes, United States Bureau of Reclamation (USBR), noted that there will be a workshop in Los Angeles on May 31st to discuss groundwater recharge. He noted to please contact him for more information. In addition, Mr. Simes noted that the Governor's Environmental and Economic Leadership Awards Program is currently accepting applications through June 22nd. Mr. Simes noted that many projects and programs may be eligible, and he encouraged interested parties to apply.