



**Disadvantaged Community (DAC) Outreach Meeting
Rural Areas**

**Tuesday September 18, 2012
10:00 am – 12:00pm**

**Indian Health Services
1320 West Valley Parkway, Suite 309
Escondido, CA 92029**

DRAFT Meeting Notes
Action items in italics

Attendees:

Jonathan Rash, Indian Health Service	Goldy Thach, City of San Diego
Dave Harvey, Rural Community Assistance Corporation	Sheri McPherson, County of San Diego
Bill Hogrewe, Rural Community Assistance Corporation	Goldy Thach, City of San Diego
Sean Sterchi, California Department of Public Health	Toby Roy, San Diego County Water Authority
Jamelle Mccullough, County of San Diego	Mark Stadler, San Diego County Water Authority
Peter Neubauer, County of San Diego	Rosalyn Prickett, RMC

1. Welcome and Introductions

Rosalyn Prickett introduced the meeting, and thanked everyone for attending.

2. IRWM Overview/Rural DAC Characterization/Participation

Rosalyn Prickett began the meeting by summarizing the purpose of the Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan, which is to ensure the “long-term sustainability of San Diego's water supply, water quality, and natural resources.” Ms. Prickett explained that the San Diego region adopted its first IRWM Plan in 2007 and is now in the process of completing a comprehensive update to that plan. Further, Ms. Prickett noted that the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) has specific provisions pertaining to economically disadvantaged communities (DACs), which are defined as those communities whose income is less than 80% of the statewide median household income. As part of the IRWM Plan Update process, the San Diego IRWM Program is conducting specific outreach and support activities to the region’s DACs.

3. Prop 84-Round 2 Grant Opportunity

Mark Stadler provided an overview of the upcoming grant opportunity for Round 2 of Proposition 84 funding. Mr. Stadler stated that DWR recently announced Round 2 of Proposition 84 implementation grant funding. There is approximately \$10.3 million available

for the San Diego Region in Round 2, which is expected to fund five to seven projects. To improve a project's likelihood of being selected to receive IRWM grant funding, a project should integrate multiple benefits and multiple project partners. An integrated project is one that contains at least one of the following components:

- **Partnerships** – Partnerships between different organizations
- **Resource Management** – Employing multiple water management strategies within a single project
- **Beneficial Uses** – Project supports several different beneficial uses
- **Geography** – Implementing watershed- or regional-scale projects
- **Hydrology** – Addressing multiple watershed functions within the hydrologic cycle

Mr. Stadler also explained that project proponents can submit projects to the online database by accessing the following web page: www.sdirwmp.org If proponents have any trouble with the database, please contact RMC (Rosalyn Prickett).

4. DAC Selection Criteria

William Hogrewe and Dave Harvey from the Rural Community Assistance Corporation (RCAC) presented an overview of the basic IRWM project selection process. The group then discussed potential modifications that are needed to fit the Rural DAC Partnership Project that was funded in Round 1 of Proposition 84 funding. Below is an overview of the discussion on this topic:

- Screening Criteria should include:
 - Meets low income (DAC) requirements: <\$48,000 annual household income
- Primary Criteria should include:
 - Public health impacts
 - Technical, managerial, and financial capability: includes likeliness to be successful as well as managerial and financial capacity
 - Shovel Ready (construction complete by May 2014)
 - Leverages other funding – some projects have 80% SDR \$, but need last 20%
 - Capital cost per connection – sliding scale, more capital cost ok for critical projects, less capital costs preferred for less critical projects
- Secondary Criteria should include:
 - Environmental justice
 - Multiple benefits (apply this to the suite of projects)
 - Incorporation of green technologies
 - Conservation, reuse, regionalization
 - Sensitivity of population (kids, elderly)
 - Transitional systems (parks, camp grounds)
- Want to look at projects that have the greatest public health benefit
- Many backcountry projects don't have engineering reports or CEQA completed, so they are not "low hanging fruit."
- *Bill to finalize list of criteria above.*
- *Group to submit updated project information, with columns for primary criteria.*
- *Will hold an additional meeting on October 16th from 11 a.m. to 3 p.m. – Bill to organize.*

Mr. Stadler also explained that project proponents can submit projects to the online database by accessing the following web page: www.sdirwmp.org If proponents have any trouble with the database, please contact RMC (Rosalyn Prickett).

Comment [c1]: I don't know what SDR stands for.

5. Identify/List all Known DAC Projects

The group identified all known DAC projects, and had an overall discussion on issues associated with DAC-related projects. Below is an overview of the discussion on this topic:

- CDPH regulates public water systems; County Department of Environmental Health (DEH) regulates systems with less than 200 connections.
- Important to simplify process for small water systems – no internal capacity.
- Indian Health Services provides engineering for tribes – need to provide similar for rural DACs.
- Need to focus tribal lands at a finer scale for DAC mapping.
 - RCAC does some median household income surveys to try to document pockets of poverty. Perhaps include surveys in Round 2 work plan?
- Issues – proper abandonment of wells no longer in use. CDPH has info on sanitary survey inspection reports.
- Folks present will be the selection committee for RCAC's Round 1 Proposition 84 project.

6. Next Steps

- Follow-up meeting to be held October 16th. Bill Hogrewe will send an Outlook appointment.