



## **Regional Advisory Committee**

### **Meeting #30 Notes**

February 2, 2011, 9:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.

San Diego County Water Authority  
4677 Overland Avenue, San Diego, CA 92123

#### **Attendance –**

---

##### **RAC Members**

Kathleen Flannery, County of San Diego (chair)  
Albert Lau and Mike Uhrhammer, Padre Dam Municipal Water District  
Anne Bamford, Industrial Environmental Association  
Beth Principe, Mission Resources Conservation District  
Bill Hunter, Santa Fe Irrigation District  
Cathy Pieroni, City of San Diego  
Craig Adams, San Dieguito River Valley Conservancy  
Doug Gibson, San Elijo Lagoon Conservancy  
Gabriel Solmer, San Diego CoastKeeper  
George Loveland, San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board  
Iovanka Todt, Floodplain Management Association  
Kirk Ammerman, City of Chula Vista  
Linda Flournoy, Planning and Engineering for Sustainability  
Linden Burzell, Yuima Municipal Water District  
Lori Vereker, City of Escondido  
Mark Weston, Helix Water District  
Peggy Strand, Sweetwater Authority  
Rob Roy, La Jolla Band of Indians  
Sheri Miller, Rural Community Assistance Corporation  
Toby Roy, San Diego County Water Authority

##### **Non-Voting Members**

Jack Simes, United States Bureau of Reclamation  
Perry Louck, Tri-County FACC –Upper Santa Margarita IRWM

##### **RWVG Staff**

Jeffery Pasek, City of San Diego  
Mark Stadler, San Diego County Water Authority  
Sheri McPherson, County of San Diego

##### **Interested Parties to the RAC**

Anna Aljabiry, Department of Water Resources  
Brett Bennett, Brown and Caldwell  
Cari Dale, City of Oceanside  
Crystal Mohr, RMC Water and Environment

Daniel Cozad, Integrated Planning and Management  
Denise Landstedt, Rancho California Water District  
Erica Ryan, City of San Marcos  
Heather Parkison, RMC Water and Environment  
Jerome Janus, Vallecitos Water District  
Lauma Jurkevics, Department of Water Resources  
Lisa Fowler, City of San Marcos  
Maria Mariscal, San Diego County Water Authority  
Michael Garrod, Sweetwater Authority  
Paul Hartman, unknown  
Roselyn Prickett, RMC Water and Environment  
Roshan Sirimanne, Mactec  
Stephanie Gaines, County of San Diego

### **Introductions**

---

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

### **San Diego IRWM Updates**

---

#### **DWR Update**

Ms. Anna Aljabiry, California Department of Water Resources (DWR), explained that the final Prop 84 Planning Grant awards will be announced this week, but there were no changes from the draft awards previously released. Contracts will be executed with awarded regions in July.

Ms. Aljabiry explained that the Prop 84 Implementation Grant Applications are in review, and that draft awards will be announced in late March. She also announced that the Prop 1E Stormwater Food Management (SWFM) Applications are due in mid-April. Technical support is available and the guidelines have been completed. Facilitation support is also available for regions that need it. Applications can be submitted directly to her.

#### **Proposition 50 Grant Administration**

Mr. Mark Stadler, San Diego County Water Authority, announced that invoices for the quarter ending December 2010 were submitted on February 2, 2011. The total reimbursement requested for the quarter, minus retention, was \$852,600. After this reimbursement, \$22 million will remain of the \$25 million award. Mr. Stadler continued with a status report on the projects, explaining that changed circumstances have caused scope and schedule amendments, but assured the group that the goals and objectives remain the same for all projects.

#### **Questions/Comments:**

- There seems to be a disparity between total reimbursements invoiced and reimbursements paid to local project sponsors. This is a serious issue for small non-profits/NGOs which have to pay staff up-front for work completed and then face a seven- to eight-month delay in receiving reimbursement. In some cases, the delay forces consideration of layoffs by NGOs.
  - SDCWA has not been reimbursed for the 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter invoices, as of today.

- As presented in the flowchart of DWR's reimbursement process last year, the bottleneck at DWR is the Accounting Department. Invoices are processed on first-come, first-served basis and there is no method by which to expedite payment.
- To ensure DAC and NGO participation in the IRWM grant program, it is important to find a way to reduce the delay in reimbursement to these project sponsors.
  - Perhaps a Statewide cash reserve/petty cash account could be established to procedurally expedite reimbursements to DAC/NGO-sponsored projects.
  - In some grant programs, up-front billing is allowed by the State up to a certain amount and that works very well for such projects.
- Request for a DWR-SDCWA timeline to identify and mitigate any local bottlenecks.

### **Proposition 84 Grant Opportunities**

Ms. Rosalyn Prickett, RMC Water and Environment, explained DWR's proposed schedule for the Proposition 84 grant cycles. Reminding the RAC that the San Diego IRWM region submitted a Planning Grant Application in late September, Ms. Prickett announced that the San Diego IRWM region was recommended for a \$1 million grant award.

Ms. Prickett also announced that an Implementation Grant Application was submitted in early January 2011 and the draft awards are anticipated to be released in May 2011. The San Diego IRWM region applied for slightly less than \$8 million, with a 25% funding match. Ms. Prickett presented a comparison of the water resource projects in the Proposition 50 application versus the Proposition 84 application. Notably, the Proposition 50 projects focused more on Water Supply whereas Proposition 84 projects focus more heavily on Water Quality and Stormwater across the region.

Ms. Prickett then discussed the Proposition 1E Stormwater Flood Management grant opportunity and pointed out that these must be submitted by the local project sponsors because the competition for funding takes place on a Statewide level. Although the applications will be submitted by individual project sponsors, the projects must be a part of the IRWM process and aligning with San Diego IRWM goals. While the maximum grant award is \$30 million, the funding match is 50%. These applications are due in April 2011.

Ms. Prickett acknowledged that for the next two years, the San Diego IRWM region will be updating its IRWM Plan. Part of that IRWM Plan update will be revisiting the long-term governance structure. To do this, various workgroups will be developed, one in specific for Governance and Financing. This workgroup will have about seven people, three from the RWMG agencies and one from each functional area. A key topic this workgroup will address is ongoing program costs. Program costs to-date were provided by the three RWMG agencies. The process for nominations for the workgroup will be announced in the next RAC meeting.

### **Questions/Comments:**

- Preparation of the Implementation Grant Application included the compilation of sections on water supply and water quality benefits, other benefits such as stakeholder involvement and recreation, and flood damage reduction for which a model was run.

### **Triennial Review Advisory Committee (TRAC)**

Ms. Sheri McPherson, County of San Diego, explained that the TRAC process has begun, with 37 representatives participating. The TRAC is a new stakeholder approach to enhance public participation in the Regional Board's Triennial Review. Suggestions have been categorized into four categories: Outside the Triennial Review Process, Housekeeping, Protective, and Reasonable. Representatives have been asked to focus on the Protective and Reasonable areas and to choose the top 10 suggestions for each. Next, Regional Board staff will compile the TRAC priorities and there will be 2 more meetings to present a snapshot of those priorities and then a hold a discussion to shorten the list. The TRAC recommendations will be presented to and considered by the Regional Board alongside the staff's list of recommendations, with the goal of Board approval by June 2011.

#### **Questions/Comments:**

- The process that the TRAC will use for narrowing down recommendations has yet to be determined.
- Due to the need to keep the process streamlined, the RAC is asked to trust the RWMG to develop a recommended list that aligns with the IRWM Plan goals and objectives.
  - The RAC is reminded that several other RAC members are also on the TRAC.
- The scope that the TRAC will cover is expected to be narrow, similar to the 2008 Triennial Review process which covered six things.

### **IRWM Triennial Report Card**

Ms. Rosalyn Prickett explained that in Section I of the IRWM Plan, the Region agreed to review projects funded by the Region's successful grants, consolidate these projects into programs, and then record progress at the program level to determine the Region's accomplishments. This review of the IRWM program accomplishments will be presented in an IRWM Triennial Report Card to be distributed in mid-2011. Ms. Prickett called the RAC's attention to a suggested outline in the back of their agenda packet.

Ms. Prickett then listed several documents which might be considered when assessing IRWM program accomplishments, including UWMPs, CUWCC BMP reports, and others. She then asked the RAC for suggestions of additional documents which should be considered.

#### **Questions/Comments:**

- Suggested documents included: SUSUMPs, MSHCP, Hydromodification Plan, Special Area Plans, San Diego County General Plan, Integrated Water Resources Plans of various agencies, park planning that might not have been rolled into other plans, plans for federal lands, coastal planning such as water quality and beach erosion, and Regional Comprehensive Plan (work with SANDAG for a birds-eye-view).

### **Quality of Life Funding Strategy**

Ms. Stephanie Gaines, County of San Diego, gave a presentation on SANDAG's Quality of Life Funding Strategy. Ms. Gaines explained that the Regional Comprehensive Plan lacks a long-term funding mechanism to address habitat conservation, shoreline preservation, water quality enhancement, and transit operations. She described that Senate Bill 1685 is the mechanism by which the Regional

Comprehensive Plan extends the taxing authority of SANDAG to three non-transportation areas, and serves as a prospective measure for taxes approved after January 1, 2009.

SANDAG invited the County of San Diego's Watershed Protection Program to take the lead in developing a cost estimate/needs assessment report. The County established a Water Quality Working Group to define regional water quality goals, develop criteria for ranking water quality priorities, and identify funding gaps. The Working Group first needed to determine whether water quality deserves regional funding and should be included in the Quality of Life Funding Strategy. Using a pilot watershed in the region and extrapolating the findings to the region, the Working Group determined that 1) water quality is an issue best addressed regionally, 2) regional and watershed-scale solutions provide a greater return on investment, 3) non-compliance has potentially significant economic and social consequences, and 4) a regional funding source will be essential to meeting the quality of life goals. According to the group's findings, water quality funding would require \$24.6 billion over 40 years. Approximately \$16 billion of the costs could be covered by current spending, Quality of Life funding, and estimated leveraged funds. This leaves a \$8.5 billion gap which regulatory changes and regional efficiencies are assumed to address. The Working Group's next steps will be to refine goals and objectives, ranking criteria, the cost estimate, and develop a Regional Water Quality Plan.

#### Questions/Comments

- Are there cost differences between prevention and treatment? For example, implementation of Transportation BMPs.
  - Yes, a good example of prevention is the Brake Pad Partnership, which seeks to reduce metals in brake pads in order to reduce non-point source pollutants.
- Please explain how the \$8.5 billion gap is expected to be bridged with regulatory changes?
  - Regulatory changes could reduce or eliminate pollutant sources. Additionally, regional monitoring could be pooled to reduce costs.
  - Regional education and outreach with regional monitoring.
- Hopefully funding by voters will bring this together. Is there an estimated return on investment or an estimate of the benefits in economic terms to persuade voters?
  - No, the benefits estimate was borrowed from the Los Angeles IRWM needs assessment. We do need to do a benefit analysis.
- Whose webpage can we find this on?
  - Project Clean Water ([http://www.projectcleanwater.org/html/quality\\_of\\_life.html](http://www.projectcleanwater.org/html/quality_of_life.html))
- Regarding the funding allocation, \$5 billion of how much goes to Water Quality?
  - \$17.5 billion - \$22 billion from SANDAG's additional half cent tax authority.
- The analysis is based on the Regional Board's Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Objectives established to sustain beneficial uses. If all benefits are equal, then it is prohibitively expensive, so those benefits need to be prioritized.

#### **The Role of Salinity Management in Water Supply**

Mr. Daniel Cozad, Integrated Planning and Management, discussed the Statewide issue of salinity in water supply. Summarizing the problem, Mr. Cozad stated that increasing salinity and nitrate levels in groundwater requires treatment before distribution to the end user. Treatments are costly since there is no economic salt removal or ocean discharge method currently available. A lack of regulatory

coordination results in additional hurdles, especially since outdated Basin Plan regulation requires standards which are overly conservative or inadequate for today's uses.

Mr. Cozad proposed that the solution includes an alternative regulatory process – preparation of Salt and Nutrient Management Plans – that are stakeholder driven in order to avoid law suits and produce scientific, irrefutable policies. Mr. Cozad claimed that IRWM's role in this process would include scoping, outreach, project implementation, and management programs, and this is reinforced in the California Water Plan Update 2009. Using the Central Valley as an example, Mr. Cozad demonstrated how stakeholder efforts function and are effective. The product of this collaboration in the Central Valley resulted in a Basin Plan Amendment development and approval process. Mr. Cozad concluded by pointing out that while salinity is a Statewide and worldwide issue, it is chronic, complex, and manageable.

Ms. Toby Roy, San Diego County Water Authority, presented on the Salinity Management Planning effort in the San Diego region. Ms. Roy began by comparing the San Diego region to the Central Valley. San Diego is different from the Central Valley with its small coastal watersheds, small groundwater basins, availability of the ocean for brine discharge, and its need to treat groundwater for use. San Diego shares similarities with the Central Valley in that the water has increasing salinity levels which limit beneficial uses and impact TMDL compliance, it has similar regulatory framework, it benefits from regional coordination and regional policies as well as the cooperation of the Regional Board and the Salinity Coalition, and it enjoys the benefits of IRWM planning.

Ms. Roy reminded the RAC that the Salinity Management Plan Guidelines developed in November 2010 establishes a tiered planning approach for groundwater basins, identifies salt loads, and includes compliance strategies. Local recycled water projects will drive the salt management plans. Desalination of groundwater, recycling, and landscape conservation are key components of the solution. Ms. Roy explained that the San Diego region does not need a big governance structure for salinity management; it just needs to determine who will handle that management. The IRWM program's Planning Grant will kick off the planning efforts and local project sponsors will fund the rest. Importantly, it is expected that the IRWM program will remain a good forum for salinity management discussions, even though that management is handled by basin.

### **Other Announcements**

---

RAC members were invited to make any other announcements to the group.

- Kathy Flannery, County of San Diego, noted that DWR will be hosting an IRWM Conference in Sacramento in May 2011 and we are seeking topics. The RWMG will be sending participants.
  - Perhaps the NGO cash flow/reimbursement issue would be a good topic?
- Mr. Jack Simes, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, reminded the RAC of the San Diego River Park Foundation's cleanup from 9-12pm on February 12<sup>th</sup>. He thanked the River Park Foundation for such cleanups on behalf of the Bureau.

### **Next RAC Meeting**

---

The next RAC meeting will be held on Wednesday April 6, 2011 from 9:00am to 11:30am at the County Operations Center (5500 Overland Avenue, Room 120).

### **Public Comments**

---

Lauma Jurkevics, DWR, announced that the Drought Report and Climate Change Accomplishments Report are both now available on DWR's website. She also noted that it would be helpful to have the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) involved in the IRWM

program to address topics such as DACs who use fishing for sustenance. She suggested that the RAC consider including CDPH who could possibly help with funding for drinking water projects.