



**Joint IRWM Plan Update Workshop #4 &
Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) Meeting #73**

April 4, 2018

9:00 am – 11:30 pm

San Diego County Water Authority Board Room

4677 Overland Avenue, San Diego, CA 92123

NOTES

Attendance

RAC Members

Lan Wiborg, City of San Diego (chair)

Arne Sandvik, Padre Dam Municipal Water District

Bill Hunter, Santa Fe Irrigation District

Greg Thomas, Rincon del Diablo Municipal Water District

Chris Trees, San Elijo Joint Powers Authority

Janice DuVall, San Diego County Board of Education

Jennifer Hazard, Rural Community Assistance Corporation

John Flores, San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians, and alternate Rob Roy, La Jolla Band of Luiseño Indians

Joseph Randall for Kimberly Thorner, Olivenhain Municipal Water District

Justin Gamble, City of Oceanside

Kimberly O'Connell, University of California – San Diego Clean Water Utility

Leslie Cleveland, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation

Mark Seits, Floodplain Management Association

Mark Stadler for Bob Yamada, San Diego County Water Authority

Meredith Meyers, San Diego CoastKeeper

Michelle Berens for Brian Olney, Helix Water District

Oscar Romo, Alter Terra

Phil Pryde, San Diego River Park Foundation

Robin Rierdan, Lakeside River Park Conservancy

Ron Mosher, Sweetwater Authority

Sandra Jacobson, California Trout

Sarah Pierce, San Diego Association of Governments

Stephanie Gaines for Ramin Abidi, County of San Diego

RWMG Staff and Consultants

Andrew Funk, City of San Diego

Loisa Burton, San Diego County Water Authority

Mark Stephens, City of San Diego

Rosalyn Prickett, Woodard & Curran

Ruth de la Rosa, County of San Diego
Sally Johnson, Woodard & Curran
Sarah Brower, City of San Diego
Stephanie Gaines, County of San Diego

Interested Parties to the RAC

Allison Danner, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
Catherine Rom, City of San Diego
Eylon Shamir, HRC
Jacob Helfman, City of San Diego
Jessica Spurlock, Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton
Katherine Donner, Amec Foster Wheeler
Maria Margarita Borja, City of San Diego

Welcome and Introductions

Ms. Lan Wiborg, City of San Diego, welcomed everyone to the meeting. Introductions were made around the room.

San Diego RWQCB Update

None.

San Diego Basin Study

Ms. Sarah Brower, City of San Diego, and Ms. Allison Danner, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, presented the progress made on Tasks 2.4 and 2.5 of the San Diego Basin Study. Ms. Danner presented the approach and preliminary model results for Task 2.4 (Structural and Operations Concepts). The goal was to assess impacts of adaptation, given different climate change and demand scenarios. Under Task 2.4, a series of portfolios were developed, including a Baseline (supply sources available in 2015), Baseline Plus (supply sources in 2015 and everything that received funding through 2017), increased supplies, enhanced conservation, optimize existing infrastructure, and watershed health/ecosystem restoration. Each portfolio included a set of adaptation concepts, with a total of 16 adaptation concepts considered in different combinations, including conveyance improvement, seawater desalination, grey water use, and recycled water, among others. The analysis included 2015 demands, 2025 demands, and 2050 demands, and considered water delivery, flood, energy, environmental, and recreational impacts of each portfolio under different climate and demand scenarios.

Ms. Danner presented some examples of preliminary results for the water delivery impacts. She also presented examples of preliminary results of shortages greater than 20,000 AF (the threshold for short-term shortages that could be absorbed by the Region, per the San Diego County Water Authority's 2015 UWMP), as well as impacts to recreation, as measured by boat ramp accessibility.

Ms. Brower presented the progress made on Task 2.5 (Trade-Off Analysis and Recommendations), reminding the group that the trade-offs analysis will help identify which portfolios to pursue when making management decisions. The team began collecting data in March and will run the trade-off analysis in April. Ms. Brower thanked everyone who participated in the surveys and informed the group

that two versions of the survey were distributed – one that was more general and focused on the adaptation concepts, and one that was focused on gathering specific project details. Thirteen evaluation objectives will be used to score the adaptation concepts. Each evaluation measure has one or more performance measures, and results in a weighted score scaled from 1 to 10. The performance measures are calculated based on model outputs, expert interviews, and GIS analysis of projects. Ms. Brower then walked the group through some examples of the performance measures and evaluation objectives. She also acknowledged that some of the questions in the surveys distributed for the data collection process may have felt incomplete or out of context, and explained that it may be that those questions fed into a GIS analysis, and were set up that way to make the analysis simpler. Ms. Brower also noted that the team was using GIS analysis on the anticipated climate change effects, including sea level rise, flood risk, warming, and fire, and stated that they were also interested in the synergistic effects of flood and fire.

The analysis will go to peer review soon, with draft results to be presented at a public workshop in June. Ms. Brower noted that the workshop will be held separately from the RAC meeting.

Questions/Comments:

- Are each set of bars [in the water deliveries results] the same volume? The Baseline Plus portfolio looks less than the Baseline portfolio.
 - Volumes are sufficient to meet the projected demands. Demands are same across all scenarios.
- Is the water from the canal lining project included in the QSA [Quantification Settlement Agreement] volume? Does that supply go on indefinitely?
 - Yes, it is included in the QSA volumes. We've modeled it as going on forever.
 - SDCWA has a 75-year contract for the canal lining water.
- Under the diversification portfolio, total demand is less because of conservation.
- [Regarding recreation impacts] the Baseline and Baseline Plus seem like the worst-case scenarios, and the Baseline Plus builds on the Baseline, so I would expect the line would shift a little up. So why does the Baseline Plus result in fewer impacts to boat ramp accessibility?
 - The model logic accounts for interactions that may cause unexpected results. Additional portfolios build on the Baseline Plus portfolio.
- For the shortages analysis, the Baseline Plus and the Environmental portfolios had similar supply mixes but resulted in different shortages. Why?
 - Good question. The team will need to look into this.
- Members of the RAC received the generic table. But they need to look at the categories monolithically. It's easier to complete the table for a specific project. Someone may have rated things lower on the generic table than on the specific project survey, due to scale. I caution you to be aware of this when looking at results.
 - Good feedback. This will help when we look at the results side by side. General responses help because we didn't want to rely on a Project Manager's responses for their project alone.
- Depending on how many questions we get on the Basin Study, it may be worth having a conference call to go through the questions with everyone.
- Thanks to Leslie and her team for all their hard work and being flexible on the schedule!

San Diego IRWM Program Update

Mr. Mark Stadler, San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA), presented updates on the statewide IRWM Program and the Proposition 1 Grant Program timeline. The Draft Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) for Round 1 Implementation Grant is anticipated in Spring 2018 with the Final PSP anticipated to be released in Summer 2018. Consultations between DWR and the Regions are expected in Fall 2018 and final applications will be due Winter 2018-19. The Prop 1 - Round 2 Implementation Grant is anticipated in 2020.

San Diego IRWM Plan Update

Mr. Stadler, presented the work being done on the 2019 San Diego IRWM Plan Update (Plan Update). He reminded the group that the Plan Update is being completed in two phases, with the first phase finalized and adopted in December 2018, which will allow the Region to continue to be eligible for funding. Additional information was provided regarding the revised climate change scoring criteria, based on input from the previous RAC meeting. The group was informed that additional climate change vulnerability information and the revised scoring criteria were provided at the back of the meeting packet.

Questions/Comments:

- Looking at the climate change vulnerabilities, the very low priorities include sea level rise damage to ecosystems and habitats. Why did that land so low?
 - Sea level rise is included at different levels of vulnerabilities. We decided that some sea level rise priorities were more important than others, from an IRWM perspective. Priorities were set by the Climate Change Workgroup. We are revisiting the vulnerabilities table based on new climate science. At the June RAC meeting we will be talking about this climate change science. The vulnerabilities scale may be something we revisit in June.

Mr. Stadler then provided an overview of the major changes being made to Chapter 3 Region Description. This chapter provides a description of the Region, including a characterization of its water resources, economy, demographics and climate. The chapter will be revised to include a more robust discussion of climate change, certainty of recycled water and potable reuse, and updated data and plans that have become available since the 2013 IRWM Plan. A list of major water infrastructure that has been completed since the 2013 IRWM Plan was presented, and the group was asked if there was anything missing. Mr. Stadler noted that a discussion of SGMA and the region's medium priority basins was being included and that the water management issues and conflicts discussion, required by DWR, was being updated. The group was reminded that the Phase 2 update would include the majority of the planned DAC and stormwater updates.

Questions/Comments:

- Add water supply to DAC concerns. Many rural areas have water supply issues.
- Is Rosarito being included as part of the Region's supply?
- What about ratepayers – are they included in the analysis? May want to consider how ratepayers feel about these efforts.
 - We don't traditionally concern ourselves with the cost of water in IRWM.

- We acknowledge water costs as an issue for DACs.
- The issue of water costs goes beyond DACs now.
 - This is a public education issue. We need to have enough supply to meet demands, and there is a cost associated with that. We need to look at cost-benefits but also need to consider that education should include that costs will always increase over time.
- Water agencies come to the IRWM table to get grant funding to help offset project costs, which help keep rate increases down. It is a good point that water costs are high. There is a breaking point for even non-DAC communities. Recently we've heard 1% escalation per month for construction costs. It's not inappropriate to say that part of the reason for participation in IRWM is to help manage rates.
- The State Board is increasingly looking at rate payers, so projects will need their support to move forward.
- Increased water rates and their impacts on economic growth should be considered.
- This is more of a larger socio-economic issue. Not sure this is something we should address in IRWM. Good point, but I don't think we should try to handle a socio-economic issue.
- Everyone wants to keep water rates as low as possible for everyone. IRWM is looking for smart, low-cost solutions. There is a lot of thought put in to rate increases, but that is not always how rate increases are perceived. We need to keep costs in mind but looking for sustainable solutions.
- Community is stripped bare of landscaping, and people are spending money to convert to low-water use landscaping. But Enhanced Conservation is one of the portfolios [included in the Basin Study]. What more can you ask of people?
 - The Basin Study and IRWM are separate efforts. The Basin Study's trade-off analysis includes consideration of costs and economic impacts. We are engaging with you so we can appropriately characterize the impacts of the adaptation strategies. The scores do reflect the cost and economic impacts. The Basin Study shows pros and cons and helps provide a picture to inform decisions on future investments. We will gladly accept your feedback.
 - Enhanced conservation is a top-down mandate in demand reduction. It is designed to assume that we meet the 20x2020 targets, then ratchet gpcd [gallons per capita per day] down by 1% each year until 2050.
- Regarding the Rosarito Desalination Plant – Otay Water District requested that it was included in the Basin Study at 15,000 AFY for Otay Water District.
 - The news recently reported that the EPA halted process to move forward with getting water from Rosarito.
- State Board has proposed legislation to limit use to 55 gpcd, moving towards 45 gpcd. This would result in water budgets for each property, and put the onus on water agencies. Instead of just questioning the water agency, should work with them to understand their rates. We are limited in what we can do about rates (especially for DACs) because of Proposition 218.
- Has the group done a workshop on the rate setting process? It's a painful process but necessary to address the cost of service. Would a workshop be helpful?
 - Response: 9 people indicated that it would.

- Back to Rosarito – Mexico should be considered as a water source. The International Boundary and Water Commission agreed that water from Mexico could be stored in U.S. dams, and Mexico would be paid in either dollars or excess water.

Ms. Stephanie Gaines, County of San Diego, presented proposed updates to Chapters 10 (Data and Technical Analysis), 6 (Governance and Stakeholders), and 8 (Resource Management Strategies [RMS]). Chapter 10 is being revised to reflect that the data management system (DMS) that was originally envisioned for the region was found to be financially unfeasible, and to identify how the region instead manages IRWM data. Chapter 6 is being updated to include the San Diego IRWM Program’s activities since the 2013 IRWM Plan, while Chapter 8 is being updated to incorporate the 2013 California Water Plan. The 2013 California Water Plan included three new RMS – sediment management, outreach and education, and water and culture – that will be incorporated into this chapter.

DAC Needs Assessment Update

Ms. Gaines presented an update on the DAC Needs Assessment. The group was informed that the assessment has been renamed to the “Water Needs Assessment” and that the RWMG and its NGO partners were working on scheduling Speakers Bureau presentations to targeted communities. Attendees representing DACs, economically disadvantaged areas (EDAs), underrepresented communities (URCs), and environmental justice (EJ) communities who were interested in having the RWMG come speak to them were encouraged to contact the RWMG.

Grant Administration

Ms. Loisa Burton, SDCWA, presented updates on grant administration. Of the eight IRWM grants that have been awarded to the San Diego IRWM Region, two (Proposition 50 and Proposition 84 Plan Update) have been completed. The Region has six open grant programs for 48 projects. Of the open grant programs, we’ve billed \$55 million, and received \$51.2 million back. Ms. Burton highlighted projects under each implementation grant, including the Sustainable Landscape Programs and Bannock Avenue Neighborhood Streetscape Enhancements for Tecolote Creek Watershed Protection project (Prop. 84 Round 1), Sustaining Healthy Tributaries to the Upper San Diego River (Prop. 84 Round 2), the near completion of the Reynolds Groundwater Desalination Facility Expansion (Prop. 84 Round 3) and Carlsbad Recycled Water Plant and Distribution System Expansion (Prop. 84 Round 3), and the success of the Rincon Customer Driven Demand Management Program (Prop. 84 Round 3), the UCSD Water Conservation & Watershed Protection project (Prop. 84 Round 4), and the Conservation Home Makeover in Chollas Creek Watershed project (Prop. 84 Round 4). Ms. Burton also presented significant milestones and upcoming activities for the Prop. 1 Plan Update grant and the Prop. 1 DAC Involvement grant. Milestones included completion of Progress Report No. 1, development of the climate change framework, DAC definitions, updates to plan chapters, stormwater modeling results and technical feasibility analysis, one-on-one webtool training for DAC Involvement grant project sponsors, and submittal of the advance payment requests.

Stormwater Capture & Use Feasibility Study Update

Ms. Gaines provided a brief announcement about upcoming activities for the Stormwater Capture & Use Feasibility Study (SWCFS). The next Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting will be held

Visit us at www.sdirwmp.org

on May 4 at the SDG&E Energy Innovation Center. This meeting will go through the cost analysis and will include a workshop on the prioritization process. Results from the analysis and the TAC meeting will be presented at the June RAC meeting.

Public Comments

None.

Summary and Next Steps

Ms. Rosalyn Prickett, Woodard & Curran, presented current and upcoming funding opportunities in the Region. There are four funding opportunities open now. Please visit each respective grant program’s website (listed below) for the most current information.

Questions/Comments:

- There is a Desalination Research Grant that closes May 1. Search for the FOA that ends in F002 on grants.gov.
 - Woodard & Curran will find this program and circulate it to the group.

Project Types	Deadline	Website
SWRCB Groundwater Sustainability		
<u>Category 1:</u> Groundwater sustainability for Severe DACs <u>Category 2:</u> GSP planning and development	Round 2 concept solicitation opens April 2018	https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/proposition1/groundwater_sustainability.shtml
USBR Title XVI / Water Infrastructure for Improvements to the Nation (WIIN) Grant		
Water reuse/reclamation projects with an USBR-approved Title XVI Feasibility Study	Spring/Summer 2018 (anticipated)	https://www.usbr.gov/watersmart/title/
USBR WaterSMART Grants		
Water and Energy Efficiency Grants	May 10, 2018	https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/view-opportunity.html?oppId=301904
Small-Scale Water Efficiency Projects	July 31, 2018	https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/view-opportunity.html?oppId=301905
Water Marketing Strategy Grants	July 17, 2018	https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/view-opportunity.html?oppId=301914

Next RAC Meeting:

- June 6, 2018 – 9:00-11:30 am