



**Regional Advisory Council
Meeting #14 Notes**

December 11, 2007, 9:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
San Diego County Water Authority
4677 Overland Avenue, San Diego, CA 92123

Attendance – RAC Members

Craig Adams, San Dieguito River Valley Conservancy
Dennis Bostad, Sweetwater Authority
Kirk Ammerman, City of Chula Vista
Kathleen Flannery, County of San Diego
Keith Lewinger, Fallbrook Public Utility District
Linda Flournoy, Planning & Engineering for Sustainability
Marsi Steirer, City of San Diego
Mark Weston, Helix Water District
Meleah Ashford, Consultant
Rob Hutsel, San Diego River Park Foundation
Susan Varty, Olivenhain Municipal Water District

Attendance – RWMG Staff

Cathy Pieroni, City of San Diego Water Department
Cecilia Padres, County of San Diego
Mark Stadler, San Diego County Water Authority
Sheri McPherson, County of San Diego
Toby Roy, San Diego County Water Authority

Attendance – Interested Parties to the RAC

Alyson Watson, RMC Water and Environment
Persephene St. Charles, RMC Water and Environment
Amanda Schmidt, RMC Water and Environment
Kelly Craig, San Diego Zoological Society
Mark Umphres, Helix Water District
Meena Westford, United States Bureau of Reclamation
Michael Welch, Consultant
Rick Alexander, Sweetwater Authority

Attendance – Public

Diana Hussey – RCD of Greater San Diego County

Introductions

Ms. Kathleen Flannery (Chairperson) welcomed Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) members to their 14th meeting. Brief introductions were made by all RAC members and interested parties.

RAC Workgroup Report

Mr. Kirk Ammerman presented an update on the Workgroup's activities since the last RAC meeting. The workgroup developed a formula to reallocate funds if project(s) drop out before the January deadline. Up to \$750,000 (3% of grant request) will be reserved for Project Administration to offset the costs associated with administering the grant. Any remaining funds will be redistributed amongst projects in the same program category up to the original request.

RAC Member Comments and Responses:

- Did the RWMG forget to include administration costs for manage the grant implementation? *During the summer months the decision was made to apply for \$25 M in grant funding, and no allowance was made to reserve funds for grant administration. When Proposition 84 comes along, the RAC and RWMG will be careful to consider this in advance.*
- Did the Workgroup consider allowing another project to be included in the package if one falls out? *The group decided if a project falls out they didn't want to bring in more projects because the best package (group of projects) had been developed.*
- What happens if San Diego gets grant funding and then a project falls out? *The State may not agree to the reallocation. The Workgroup's allocation will only be implemented if project(s) become infeasible prior to the application deadline (January 28).*

Conclusions/Actions

None

IRWMP Funding Program Update

Mr. Mark Stadler provided an update on the IRWMP Funding Program. He reviewed the statistics from the Round 2 Step 1 application process. Eligible applications from 17 regions were received, of which five were from Southern California and 12 were from Northern California. The total of all grant funds requested was \$200 million (\$200M), while the total proposal costs were over 1 billion dollars (\$1B).

Based on a competitive evaluation of all submitted applications, the San Diego Region (Region) was called back to submit an application for the Step 2 application, which is the final step in the Prop 50 Implementation Grant process. The Region received a score of 58 out of 75 points. The feedback from the state was that all items were well-addressed. In the scoring, the Region lost more than one point in only two areas: having an adopted plan and addressing disadvantaged communities/environmental justice issues. RMC Water and Environment is working with project proponents to gather information to develop the Step 2 application, which consists of 14 attachments. A maximum of two letters of support are being requested from project proponents. The letters must clearly state how the project will benefit the individual or entity providing the letter. Based on conversations with representatives from the Department of Water Resources (DWR) and State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) at the recent Prop 50 workshop, it may be necessary for all project proponents to adopt the IRWM Plan (Plan).

Mr. Stadler discussed the current structure for Round 2 funding. There is a total of \$51.8M available due to reallocation of some Prop 50 funding into the Local Groundwater Assistance (LGA) program. In order to meet established ratios between Northern and Southern California, the Southern

California regions would have to receive a minimum of \$43M from the Prop 50 and LGA programs combined. Other Southern California regions are lobbying to secure the entire \$51.8M for Southern California.

Finally, Mr. Stadler reviewed the status of the Prop 84 funding schedule. He said that Prop 84 funding has not been authorized for FY 08/09. The release date for draft guidelines is expected to be by late summer 2008. Planning and implementation grant funds from Prop 84 will be delayed. The Region is coordinating to set up a preliminary meeting with the Orange County Region to discuss Prop 84 funding. Borrego and other eastern areas fall under the Colorado River area.

RAC Member Comments and Responses:

- We should advocate for Southern California to receive the full 51.8 M. Is there some boiler text language that is available to request this? *A memorandum should be developed and include the following points.*
 - 1) *How much has been given to Prop 50 and how much would we get back?*
 - 2) *Include the timing of response from proponents to return back to RAC*
- When must letters of support be received? *They must be received by RMC by January 25th, 2008.*
- What is the consequence of having the Plan adopted? We need to have someone high up in the Water Authority to discuss this with DWR.
- What if a project proponent does not adopt the Plan – would their project fall out? Some proponents may not necessarily agree with everything in the Plan. *This possibility will be dealt with when it is known officially if project proponents have to adopt the IRWMP.*
- How will the funding allocations be determined? *The proposals will be scored and then ranked in descending order. The best proposals will receive funding. However Southern California must receive at least \$43M. If all winning proposals are from Southern California, then Southern California could receive the entire \$51.8M.*

Conclusions/Actions

None

Implications of State's Revised IRWM Funding for San Diego's IRWM Planning

Ms. Alyson Watson (RMC Water and Environment) reviewed the implications of the revised IRWM funding breakdown. The reduction in available Prop 50 funding and the Prop 84 schedule delays add an element of uncertainty. Planning grant funds will be used to update the Plan and complete several short-term priorities. At the RAC's request, the RWMG has agreed to commit to the current level of effort through the Prop 84 planning grant (approximately 2 fiscal years). The tasks that will be included in this will be RAC meeting coordination, Prop 50 contract management, Prop 84 tracking and comments, and Prop 84 planning grant preparation and submittal. Due to the delay in Prop 84, there will be few key decisions to be made by the RAC in the near-term. In the meantime, subcommittees can be developed to support the interim structure. As a result, the RWMG recommends the RAC move to a bi-monthly meeting schedule, with the option to increase meeting frequency as necessary. These meetings can be used as a forum for educating the group on issues that cut across various aspects of water management ("cross-threading") to build a knowledge base in preparation for an IRWM Plan update and implementation of short-term priorities.

Ms. Persephene St. Charles (RMC Water and Environment) facilitated discussion on short term priorities and specific issues to be addressed by the RAC subcommittees. Ms. St. Charles presented the list of eight short-term issues and priorities based on those listed in the Plan. The RAC discussed how these issues and priorities could best be addressed by subcommittees.

Initial discussion revolved around the potential subcommittees and what potential short term issues and priorities each subcommittee would address. Subcommittees were suggested for governance, implementation and public outreach.

The discussion then moved to potential cross-threading topics to be discussed at upcoming RAC meetings. The RAC developed additional ideas in addition to the ones listed in the presentation.

RAC Member Comments and Responses:

- What is the timeline for Prop 84? Does it begin at the back end of when implementation grants end? *Our current estimate is 2012. The RAC may choose to write letters to legislature requesting that the grant program be initiated sooner to allow for implementation of projects.*
- When does implementation grant funds have to be spent by? *There is no set date that funds have to be spent by.*
- The delay in Prop 84 funding is the result of state legislature delays.
- The institutional structure should not be a sub-committee responsibility because it is a core item.
- The composition of the sub-committees will be critical. It is important to get a good cross section. The sub-committees should discuss the issues and bring back recommendations to the RAC. *Yes, the role of the subcommittees is to accomplish tasks that would be too much work for the larger group.*
- The sub-committee meetings should be more frequent to get more things done.
- Work should be done in public outreach to gather the support of disadvantaged communities and to ensure environmental justice issues are addressed.
- The timeline for the preparation of an updated Plan should be established. *Yes, establishing a date will provide a target to work and plan with to ensure that proper time is allotted to accomplish those items that have time requirements and to avoid rushing development of the updated Plan.*
- Adoption should also be included in the “Prepare a Revised and Updated Version of the IRWM Plan” item.
- The sub-committee on public outreach should focus on bringing more projects into the Plan.
- Outreach should also focus on legislature to bring in more partners into the Plan.
- There should be another committee that implements the Plan. Use the Outreach committee. *We have to be sensitive to funding available. The RWMG will work to achieve this.*

Conclusions/Actions

The RAC decided that two subcommittees should be formed to represent the following short term priorities and issues.

Governance Sub-committee:

- Establish a Regional IRWM Institutional Structure

- Address the Role of Watersheds in the Institutional Structure
- Address the Role of Functional Areas in the Institutional Structure

Implementation Sub-committee:

- Stakeholder Outreach and Public Involvement
- Establish a Regional, Web-Based Data Management System
- Address Deficiencies in the Basin Plan WQ Objectives
- Complete an Updated Assessment of Local Water Management Plans

The RAC decided the following considerations should be taken into account regarding the RAC subcommittees:

- Sub-committee representation will be important
- Sub-committees will develop a recommendation and alternatives will be discussed and addressed
- Multiple RAC meetings may be necessary to resolve subcommittee issues
- Meetings should be open
- Policy related priorities will require more frequent RAC coordination than technical priorities
- A schedule should be developed to drive subcommittee activities
- Stakeholder outreach and public involvement is a good place to start
- Subcommittees should develop a list of issues for planning grant, including adoption
- The focus of the stakeholder outreach subcommittee should be resolved (e.g. is it on the Plan, projects, DAC-EJ issues, or to responding to the legislature?)
- Planning process and targets should be developed
- A subcommittee could be formed to implement the Plan

The RAC brainstormed several cross-threading topics that could be addressed at RAC meetings, and suggested that experts be solicited to present on relevant topics. Suggested topics include:

- Recycled Water Planning and indirect potable reuse (IPR)
- Legislative updates
- Water Reuse (including gray water)
- Sustainability
- Success criteria and metrics
- Models from other regions
- Land use planning
- Ocean protection
- Existing infrastructure in County/State and ways to integrate those
- Energy and water
- Climate changes and greenhouse gases
- Methodologies/common approaches to measuring
- Water quality protection instead of term “stormwater planning”
- Solicitation of presenters and experts through outreach

Revision of Projects in the Proposition 50 Application Package

Ms. Watson discussed potential revisions to projects in the Prop 50 Application package. Some projects in the application package have changed since the Workgroup selection process was completed. The RWMG requested that the RAC establish a procedure for addressing substantive changes to projects. The new rule that was suggested was: "If a project changes in a way that would have affected the project selection process, the Workgroup will review the changes to the project to determine whether to keep the project in the package".

Ms. Watson discussed the projects in question. The first project, Conservation in the Campo Valley, is a land acquisition project. This project has changed in that the land targeted for acquisition by the current project will be in a different watershed from that originally proposed. In addition, the amount of matching funds dropped significantly, and the protection of groundwater as a project objective has become unclear. The project has habitat value as a wildlife corridor, but there is no apparent linkage for water supply. The Back Country Land Trust is the proponent, and the suggested grant funding amount is \$650,000. The original area of land for purchase was 1,600 acres versus 1,100 acres in the revised project. The revised acquisition would take place in the Bell Valley, which represents 75% of all acquisitions in the proposal by acreage.

The second project discussed was the City of San Diego's Indirect Potable Reuse Pilot/Demonstration project being proposed as an additional modification to their existing recycled water project. The City of San Diego would reduce funding for the other project components so that amount of requested funding would not change. This project is not currently in the existing Plan and will need to be added and then have the Plan readopted before January 28.

RAC Member Comments and Responses:

- Should the same recommendations be followed to determine whether the project should be included in Prop 50 package? Same format as the original project selection process? This could be done by email. *Because this process falls under the Brown Act, this cannot be completed over email.*
- The Workgroup decided on the original Campo Valley project which was recommended to and approved by the RAC. The project has changed so much it is not the original project and it should be dropped out.
- The fundamental issue is that the Campo Valley project is losing the relationship to surface and groundwater supply.
- Do we know what happened to other parcels? *No, we don't have that information at the current time.*
- The amount of grant money received may not be \$25M, so this \$650K match is not that big of a deal. The money will have to be divided up anyway.
- We want to have a well-balanced package. Will we maintain that if we remove 75% of the land acquisition in the proposal by taking out the Campo Valley project? *It should be a strong package without the project.*
- The IPR project is a great project, however it compromise the of project selection process
- The Prop 50 application package already has a suite of projects and should it be altered?
- We want to keep the integrity of the process – there are projects in the package that will produce recycled water. There is no guarantee that IPR will produce recycled water.
- The IPR project must be consistent with the Plan.
- There is a problem with making changes in the overall package at this point in time – it's very late in the game.

- Changing or adding projects at the eleventh hour is not a good practice.
- The IPR project cannot be a new individual project – it must be folded into the City of San Diego’s existing recycled water project.
- At some point the RAC/RWVG has to stop making changes and submit the final application.
- Chair is requested to ask alternate RAC members to attend the January meeting to make sure there are enough people to vote in case RAC members cannot attend meeting. There must be enough RAC members in attendance to have vote.

Conclusions/Actions

The RAC instructed the Workgroup reconvene and discuss the issues and then make a recommendation to the RAC. The project proponents should be available to the Workgroup by phone or in person to answer questions. The RAC will meet again in January, and a final vote will be made on how to address the project changes.

Other Updates

No other updates were discussed.

Future Agenda Items

The next RAC meeting will be held in January at the San Diego Water Authority. The date and time will be announced once the meeting has been scheduled.

Public Comments

No public comments were received.