



**Regional Advisory Committee
Meeting #34 Notes**

October 5, 2011, 9:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
San Diego County Water Authority
4677 Overland Avenue, San Diego, CA 92123

Attendance

RAC Members

Kathy Flannery, County of San Diego (chair)
Albert Lau, Padre Dam Municipal Water District
Anne Bamford, Industrial Environmental Association
Barry Lindgren, San Elijo Lagoon Conservancy
Cari Dale, City of Oceanside
Craig Adams, San Dieguito River Valley Conservancy
Crystal Najera, City of Encinitas
Dave Harvey, Rural Community Assistance Corporation
Denise Landstedt, Tri-County FACC, Upper Santa Margarita River Watershed
Eric Larson, Farm Bureau of San Diego County
George Loveland, San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board
Iovanka Todt, Floodplain Management Association
Jack Simes, United States Bureau of Reclamation
Jennifer Kovecses for Gabriel Solmer, San Diego CoastKeeper
Judy Mitchell, Mission Resources Conservation District
Toby Roy for Ken Weinberg, San Diego County Water Authority
Khalique Khan, DOD Installations in San Diego County
Kirk Ammerman, MS4 Copermittees
Linda Flournoy, Planning and Engineering for Sustainability
Mark Weston, Helix Water District
Marsi Steirer, City of San Diego
Mark Umphres, Helix Water District
Mike Thornton, San Elijo Joint Powers Authority
Perry Louck, Tri-County FACC, Upper Santa Margarita River Watershed
Richard Pyle, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce
Ron Mosher, Sweetwater Authority
Rob Hutsel, San Diego River Park Foundation
Shelby Tucker, San Diego Association of Governments

RWMG Staff

Cathy Pieroni, City of San Diego
Jeffery Pasek, City of San Diego
Sheri McPherson, County of San Diego
Loisa Burton, San Diego County Water Authority
Mark Stadler, San Diego County Water Authority

Interested Parties

Arne Sandvik, Padre Dam Municipal Water District
Brian Moniz, Department of Water Resources
Crystal Mohr, RMC Water and Environment
Dana Frieauf, San Diego County Water Authority
Deena Raver, County of San Diego
Drew Kleis, City of San Diego
Heather Parkison, RMC Water and Environment
Jack Bebe, Fallbrook Public Utilities District
Jane Davies, Sweetwater Authority
John Van Rhyn, County of San Diego
Joseph Randall, Olivenhain Municipal Water District
Kurt Tellefsen, Tellefsen and Associates
Mike Hastings, Los Peñiquitos Lagoon Foundation
Roselyn Prickett, RMC Water and Environment
Wayne Chiu, San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board

Introductions

Ms. Kathleen Flannery (chair), County of San Diego, welcomed everyone to the meeting. Ms. Flannery also introduced Cari Dale, City of Oceanside, who is a new RAC member. Introductions were made around the room.

Mr. Brian Moniz, Department of Water Resources (DWR), was asked to provide any updates from DWR. Mr. Moniz stated that DWR has released their Anticipated Schedule of Future IRWM Grant Solicitations, which is a draft schedule that DWR will use for future planning purposes. Mr. Moniz also noted that the Proposition 1E Stormwater and Flood Management award recommendations have been released, and within the San Diego region the City of Escondido was recommended to receive approximately \$15,000,000. In addition, he noted that the San Diego Proposition 84 Planning Grant has been executed between the San Diego County Water Authority and DWR.

San Diego IRWM Updates

Proposition 50 Grant Administration

Ms. Loisa Burton provided an overview on Proposition 50 Grant Administration. She explained that the Santa Margarita Conjunctive Use Project (Project 10) has an executed contract as of August 24, 2011 and is now in motion. Amendment Number 3, which includes amendments to the San Diego Region Reservoir Intertie Project (Project 12) and the Green Mall Porous Paving and Infiltration Project (Project 18), is being processed by DWR and is anticipated to arrive at SDCWA on October 10th for finalization. Amendments to the Over Irrigation/Bacteria Reduction

Project (Project 3) are still in review by DWR, and SDCWA anticipates receiving amendments from DWR in the next few weeks. To date, the region has received approximately \$5.4 million from DWR, and is requesting that DWR release the retention funds for two recently completed projects.

Ms. Burton provided an overview of administration issues relating to lost documentation and payment delays that the San Diego region has faced. In July 2011, SDCWA learned that the February 2011 invoices submitted to DWR (approximately \$940,000) were lost in the DWR mail room. This delay and other delays in the process led the RAC to submit a letter to DWR in July 2011, which expressed concern for how such delays would impact non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and disadvantaged community (DAC) organizations, and provided a series of recommendations to alleviate and potentially avoid such delays. In August 2011, the region received a response letter from DWR acknowledging our concerns.

Mr. Brian Moniz reiterated that DWR is taking steps to improve internal communication and is working on steps to improve the grant administration process. He noted that the current invoice processing period is between 45 and 60 days, meaning that it takes this long to process invoices from the point they are received by DWR until when checks are cut. Mr. Moniz stated that in order to streamline this process, DWR is working on an electronic submittal process (for supporting documentation only). He also noted that DWR cannot expedite invoices for NGOs and DACs, and DWR will continue to process invoices on a first-come, first-serve basis. Mr. Moniz suggested that SDCWA and the San Diego region could choose to expedite NGO and DAC invoices by submitting them first and separately from other invoices.

Mark Stadler, SDCWA, and Loisa Burton followed-up, stating that SDCWA already does prioritize NGO and DAC invoices. Mr. Stadler also noted that the San Diego region would be pleased to see a 45-60 day turn around period on invoices, because it often takes the region much longer to receive payment from DWR. Mr. Moniz responded that it is his personal goal to dramatically improve DWR's Proposition 50 Implementation Grant processing time.

Potential Grant Redistribution

Ms. Sheri McPherson, County of San Diego, provided an overview of two Proposition 50 projects that may be unable to proceed. While local project sponsors for these projects have not formally stated that they cannot fulfill their Proposition 50 contractual obligations, the RWMG has been in contact with DWR, and they are in support of the region's goal of keeping any money not utilized for these projects within the region.

Mr. Mark Weston, Helix Water District, provided an overview of the El Monte Valley Groundwater Recharge and River Restoration Project. He stated that the scope was to receive advanced treated water (recycled water) from Padre Dam Municipal Water District (MWD) and use it to supplement the El Monte Valley groundwater basin. In addition, the project would involve substantial river restoration efforts within the El Monte Valley. Due to economic issues, upgrades to Padre Dam MWD's Water Reclamation Facility for advanced water treatment have been delayed. In addition, the Environmental Impact Report for the project revealed substantial cultural resources issues. The Helix Water District Board believes that the State of California is ready to have conversations regarding direct potable reuse (DPR), and as such they have decided to suspend the project and focus on regulatory issues relating to DPR. They have not yet decided whether to suspend the grant for some time while DPR issues are figured out, or whether to stop the project altogether.

Mr. Al Lau, Padre Dam MWD, followed-up on Mr. Weston's comments, noting that Padre Dam MWD has temporarily suspended their Capital Improvement Program (CIP), and has also postponed expansion of their water reclamation facility due to reduced demands. Padre Dam MWD views this as a temporary delay, during which time they will explore doing other work including exploring groundwater recharge through direct injection within the Santee area.

Ms. Sheri McPherson provided an overview of the current issue regarding these potential funds, referencing the "Approach to Redistributing Round 2 (Proposition 50) Implementation Grant Funds Should Project Become Unviable," which the Proposition 50 Project Selection Workgroup created in November 2007. Ms. McPherson also referenced criteria that have been provided by DWR for redistribution of grant funding. The RWMG is proposing to reconvene the Proposition 50 Project Selection Workgroup in November such that the Workgroup could bring back a formal recommendation at the November 30th RAC meeting.

Ms. Kathy Flannery asked if there was a second to the motion proposed by Ms. McPherson. The motion was seconded, and voted upon. Voting RAC members voted in favor of this motion.

Questions/Comments:

- How much money is available should these projects not proceed?
 - *If both projects do not go forward, \$5.6 million will be available.*
- It is important to establish a framework upfront and it is absolutely critical to ensure that this money remains in San Diego. In order to ensure the money remains in San Diego, the group needs to develop a successful strategy for redistribution that maximizes flexibility to allow the Workgroup to be as creative as possible.
- It is helpful to remember the original project selection process. Each project was asked to reduce their budget by a certain amount (and some reduced their scopes as well). Perhaps the Workgroup could explore the idea of restoring these budgets and scopes.
- Since the focus of these projects was water supply, the region should try to ensure that any newly funded projects have similar benefits (5,000 AF of new supply).
- It is possible that these projects could still move forward, so it may not be necessary to reconvene the Workgroup.
 - *DWR's stipulations include a requirement that Proposition 50-funded projects should be complete in 2014, although this date could potentially shift. However, due to this potential time constraint, they would like to have the Workgroup reconvene and make a recommendation so that the region can go forward with the amendment process, which will likely take many months.*
- Will the match already incurred by Padre Dam MWD and Helix Water District count towards the region's funding match percentage?
 - *These details will be worked out with DWR.*
- Why are only Proposition 50 projects being considered? Could Proposition 84 projects be considered as well?
 - *New projects would require a new review process and time is limited.*
 - *Mr. Brian Moniz, DWR, noted that introducing new projects would change the overall Proposition 50 application, which is why DWR would like to keep the money with projects included within the original application.*

- A concern was raised regarding timing: will applicants have sufficient time to respond to the Workgroup's requests?
 - *Applicants will be contacted following the recommendation made by the Workgroup, and that the Workgroup will work to resolve logistical issues involved in the process. RWMG also noted the desire to resolve this issue at a greater level such as to address the possibility of this same event occurring with future and other existing (Proposition 84 Implementation Grant) projects.*
- If portions of the existing Padre Dam MWD and Helix Water District projects can continue to move forward, this will be reported and worked out with the Workgroup.
- In the event that a previous Workgroup member could not serve, positions could be filled in first by alternates, second by a person within the agency of the original member, and third by Funding Area, and that the Chairman of the Workgroup (Kirk Ammerman) would have the flexibility to fill in Workgroup positions and make these decisions as necessary.

IRWM Plan Update

Mr. Mark Stadler provided an overview of the IRWM Plan Update. He reiterated that the Planning Grant contract has been executed at both ends (SDCWA and DWR). In addition, during the previous week, SDCWA received a commitment letter for the Proposition 84 Implementation Grant agreement. Mr. Stadler noted that local project sponsors should be receiving information regarding any necessary amendments (they must maintain or increase purported level of benefits), as well as a request for CEQA compliance information.

The RWMG is happy to announce that they have officially re-hired RMC Water and Environment to serve as the consultant for the IRWM Plan Update process. RMC will be working with a team of consultants, and the group has a kickoff meeting to start the process off this month.

Mr. Stadler provided an overview of the IRWM Plan Update schedule, which has many moving parts, and will require a lot of coordination. Mr. Stadler noted that as demonstrated within the schedule, there will be many opportunities for RAC members, other interested parties, and members of the public to get involved in this process. Outside of RAC meetings, there will be public workshops and workgroups as well. The RWMG would like RAC members to consider whether or not they would like to serve on the workgroups.

Questions/Comments:

- 2-3 members of the RAC should serve on all of the workgroups in order to ensure that some in the process maintain an understanding of the overall process and avoid duplicative efforts.
- How will the RAC contribute to the Local Groundwater Assistance and Stormwater Flood Management grant opportunities through DWR?
 - *The Governance & Financing Workgroup is convening early in the process to address such issues as other grant opportunities and financing options.*
- How will the IRWM Plan review work in coordination with Round 2 of Implementation Grant applications, since the IRWM Plan Update will not be finished before projects are solicited for this grant cycle?
 - *The RWMG has asked DWR this same question, and will report back when they receive clarification.*

Los Peñiquitos Watershed Planning Panel

Mr. Drew Kleis, City of San Diego, served as the moderator for this panel and provided background information for watershed planning in San Diego. Mr. Kleis noted that the panel includes Wayne Chiu from the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), Mike Hastings from the Los Peñiquitos Lagoon Foundation, and himself from the City of San Diego's Stormwater Division. The key purpose of the panel is to discuss integration of various planning processes relating to watershed issues (mainly water quality).

Mr. Mike Hastings provided an overview of the Los Peñiquitos Lagoon, noting that the overall loss of the floodplain surface area and increased channelization within the watershed have resulted in changes in the lagoon. These changes (mainly due to land use changes) have resulted in substantial hydromodification and increased erodibility of soils, which have caused impacts such as increased dry weather flows (of freshwater), increased scouring, increased runoff volumes and peak flows, and increased soil deposition. In response to impacts, the Los Peñiquitos Lagoon Foundation is working on a phased-approach, including development of the Los Peñiquitos Lagoon Sediment and Fresh Water Management Plan. The Foundation has also been involved in establishing a sediment Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL), and is working to coordinate their planning efforts with those being conducted by the City of San Diego, the State Parks, and other stakeholders.

Mr. Wayne Chiu provided a discussion of regulations in the Los Peñiquitos Watershed, focusing on TMDLs and the Municipal Storm Water Permit (MS4 Permit). He noted that these two processes were previously separate, however the RWQCB is working to integrate them to have similar goals, be adaptable, and have new and better mechanisms for improving water quality. Previous efforts were conducted by the RWQCB "behind closed doors," but that recent efforts on the Third Party TMDL have focused on involving stakeholders early on in the process, and have proven to be more productive. Now the RWQCB is focused on being strategic, adaptive, and synergistic, and the Executive Officer is committed to making changes that lead to maximization of resources and better integration.

Mr. Drew Kleis provided an overview of TMDL planning in the Los Penasquitos Watershed, noting that there are many overlapping planning/regulatory efforts, and the City is also addressing an aging/under-designed storm drain system. There needs to be a comprehensive approach that addresses multiple pollutants at once, integrates storm water quality and flood control, and views stormwater as a resource (water supply). The City originally set their goals to align with the Basin Plan and other regulations, but found from stakeholders that this was seen as a limitation. The question has arisen in this process if focusing on meeting numeric targets is really effective in meeting overall water quality goals. As such, the City has moved towards the idea of Ecological Objectives, which aim to more closely represent true watershed goals and also facilitate integrated planning efforts. The RWQCB would need to lead this effort (focusing efforts away from numeric targets), because some agencies such as EPA are still focused on numerical limits.

Ms. Cathy Pieroni provided an overview of the aforementioned issues through the lens of IRWM. She noted that within the Planning Grant application, the region included a White Paper on Collaboration with the Regional Board, which will be a forum for addressing coordination with multiple planning and regulatory efforts such as reforming Basin Plan water quality (numeric) objectives.

Questions/Comments:

- Biological (ecological) objectives make sense in that they are more reflective of water quality goals and meeting beneficial uses. There is a concern though regarding how to use resources to best address development/analysis of new objectives.
- Appreciate focus on implementation and focus on how we will get to meeting objectives and maintaining beneficial uses.
- Would like to compliment this effort (IRWM effort). The RWQCB is very interested in outcome-based efforts rather than numeric limits.
- Looking at outcomes, would it be useful to look at maximums rather than minimums? In other words, would it be useful to look at what a fully functioning watershed would look like and try to reach X% of that functioning level?
 - *The region is aimed at a tiered approach that focuses on looking at the whole watershed rather than specific water bodies.*

Completed Prop 50 Project

Ms. Deena Raver from the County of San Diego gave an overview of the Chollas Creek Runoff Reduction and Groundwater Recharge Project (Project #19), which was recently completed. The project included impervious pavements, retention basins, vegetated swales, and other components. The purpose of this project was to increase impermeability (and therefore reduce runoff), therefore reducing stormwater runoff, and improving water quality within the Chollas Creek Watershed. Ms. Raver noted specific issues that the project encountered, due to overly impacted soils, and other issues relating to design and implementation. These issues have all been resolved, and the County is continuing to monitor previously problematic sites to ensure that everything is functioning properly.

Questions/Comments:

- Will you release the Project Completion Report with revised bid documents (for other agencies to review) since this is a Pilot Project?
 - *SDCWA has the bid document records and Project Completion Reports within their Local Project Sponsor (Prop 50) database. Have thought about creating outreach documents for education purposes. Real key is getting contractors with knowledge.*

Next RAC Meeting

Ms. Kathy Flannery announced that the next RAC meeting will be held on November 30, 2011.

Public Comments

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

- Mr. Jack Simes, Bureau of Reclamation, noted that the USEPA is working on Environmental Justice issues. There will be a call on October 6th at 11:30 PST to discuss this issue.
- Mr. Brian Moniz noted that DWR plans on hosting a Process Improvements Workshop in early December regarding the grant process.