



**Joint IRWM Plan Update Workshop #3 &
Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) Meeting #72**

February 7, 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

Ramin Abidi, County of San Diego (chair)

Ann Van Leer, Escondido Creek Conservancy

Bill Hunter, Santa Fe Irrigation District

Chris Helmer, City of Imperial Beach

Janice DuVall, San Diego County Board of Education

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

Mark Seits and Alternative, Alex Yescas, Floodplain Management Association

Mark Stadler for Bob Yamada, San Diego County Water Authority

Michael McSweeney, Building Industry Association

Michelle Berens for Brian Olney, Helix Water District

Mike Thornton, San Elijo Joint Powers Authority

Oscar Romo, Alter Terra

Phil Pryde, San Diego River Park Foundation

Roberto Yano, City of Chula Vista

Robyn Badger, San Diego Zoo Global

Ron Mosher, Sweetwater Authority

Sarah Pierce, San Diego Association of Governments

RWMG Staff and Consultants

Andrew Funk, City of San Diego

Bill Luksic, San Diego County Water Authority

Gail Patton, San Diego County Water Authority

Jen Sajor, Woodard & Curran

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

Anne Bamford, Member of the Public
Brian Hojnack, City of San Diego
Catherine Rom, City of San Diego
Chandra Richards, Resource Conservation District San Diego County
David Pohl, ESA
Jacob Helfman, City of San Diego
Joel Kramer, San Diego State University, Geography Department
Laura Walsh, Climate Collaborative
Lisa Wu, City of San Diego
Maria Margarita Borja, City of San Diego
Ruth de la Rosa, County of San Diego

Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Ramin Abidi, County of San Diego, welcomed everyone to the meeting. Introductions were made around the room.

San Diego RWQCB Update

None.

Stormwater Capture & Use Feasibility Study Update

Ms. Stephanie Gaines, County of San Diego, and Mr. David Pohl, ESA, presented a summary of the Stormwater Capture & Use Feasibility Study (SWCFS) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting #3. The SWCFS includes the following tasks:

1. Existing conditions
2. Feasibility Analysis
3. Cost Analysis
4. Implementation Approach/Prioritization
5. Feasibility Report

TAC Meeting #3 focused on the results of the Feasibility Analysis modeling approach (Task 2). It was noted that although the modeling approach was used for public parcels for the SWCFS, it can be applied to other scenarios, such as private parcels.

Mr. Pohl started by acknowledging the RAC members that are involved in the TAC. The results showed lower estimates for the potential volume of stormwater that could be captured and the number of feasible parcels that could be used for stormwater capture as compared to quantities documented in the Storm Water Resource Plan (SWRP). In addition, discharge rates for the wastewater treatment alternative use were much lower than expected. These results were attributed to the refined screening

process used in the SWCFS modeling approach. Mr. Pohl noted that there was a wide range of estimated regional volumes, depending on the criteria used. The project team considered the most feasible options as well as other opportunities in the region.

The San Diego region has a number of constraints for capture, such as small groundwater basins, which can lead to greater sensitivity when screening potential parcels. Mr. Pohl described Steps 3 through 6 of the quantification process. Step 3 was the identification of stormwater use alternatives. A total of eight alternative uses were identified. These alternative uses included infiltration to groundwater aquifers for potable use and discharge to a wastewater treatment plant for solids management. In Step 4 the project team identified 19 example projects. The example projects were used to identify regional and project-specific constraints and opportunities. This can be used as management tool to assess the feasibility of similar stormwater capture and use projects. Constraints include absence of existing infrastructure, funding, and regulatory ambiguity. Step 5 refined the parcel list by applying constraints identified in Step 4. Some constraints were applied to all alternative uses, while others were alternative use-specific. For example, one screening criterion, which was applied to all alternative uses, excluded parcels that were greater than one acre in area. Alternative C (Irrigation) had two criteria in which 1) a parcel must be within one-fourth of a mile of a park, golf course, or recreational area, and 2) a major MS4 outfall must be located within the parcel. A sensitivity analysis was done for screening criterion that produced the largest number of exclusions. In these cases, the project team relaxed the criterion in order to expand the parcel list, where reasonable. With the sensitivity analysis, the total feasible number of parcels went from 211 to 977, which was considered the range of feasible parcels. In Step 6, the project team developed volumes for each alternative use, based on the total feasible parcel range developed in Step 5. The development of volumes used assumptions based on multiple constraints, such as site characteristics and matching production with demand.

Ms. Gaines discussed the actual volumes quantified for each alternative use and TAC questions from their meeting. One question the TAC raised was whether storage volumes were “capped” based on certain timeframes. The study initially used a 1-hour release based on parcel size but was then adjusted it to a 1 cubic foot per second (cfs) release. The TAC Meeting #3 summary will be posted on the Project Clean Water website soon. Ms. Gaines encouraged the RAC and the public to review Technical Memo (TM) #2 on www.projectcleanwater.org. Comments are due on Friday, February 16 at Close of Business.

Questions/Comments:

- There are programs in the Region that aim to enhance streamflow, but this project slows this down. How do you marry these two ideas?
 - We struggle with this all the time in stormwater. Regulators want us to prevent all dry weather flow, but some dry weather flows support habitat. This question is probably better suited for a bigger discussion. However, some alternative uses, like infiltration to groundwater to reestablish natural hydrology, may support habitat and the environment. Our limitation is that we are only looking at public parcels, but this methodology can be applied to look at parcels with potential for discharge to creeks.
- In the long-run does this model account for sea level rise or tidal influence and salinity? Or is this only looking further up in the watershed?
 - Yes, we are looking at recharging stormwater for coastal areas to push back saltwater intrusion. This addresses Climate Change in the IRWM Plan.

Visit us at www.sdirwmp.org

- There are surprisingly fewer parcels than expected. Are there any projects that are rising to the top?
 - Yes, we had this discussion with the TAC. The highest rated and best use projects will depend on organizations' and water managers' priorities. This analysis provides a tool to look constraints and opportunities and analyze the feasibility of an alternative use to determine the best project for your interests.
- Does this study show how much is discharged to the sewer system?
 - The study does not. However, we did look at two sewersheds' treatment facilities and determined their capacities. We did an assessment of what the quantity could be and used the treatment facilities' near-term capacity as the low-end volume of discharge.
- Do you have a process to come up with a cost-benefit analysis?
 - That is the next part of the analysis. It won't be a conventional cost-benefit analysis, but costs will be analyzed based on the example projects we've identified.

San Diego IRWM Program Update

Mr. Mark Stadler, San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA), presented updates on the statewide IRWM Program. Mr. Stadler updated the RAC with recent changes in the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) leadership. Grant Davis has stepped down from Director of DWR after only nine months. This is considered a huge loss as Mr. Davis was a major advocate and supporter of the IRWM Program. He will be returning to his former position as the General Manager of Sonoma County Water Agency. Karla Nemeth has been appointed as the new Director of DWR. Ms. Nemeth had served as the governor's Deputy Secretary and Senior Advisor for Water Policy at the California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA) since 2014. Previous to that position she was the project manager for the Bay Delta Conservation Plan from 2009 to 2014. She has been instrumental to the development of the Bay Delta tunnels project. Following the governor's appointment, DWR underwent reconstruction of their executive team to include two new positions – Deputy Director for Flood Management and Dam Safety and Deputy Director for Integrated Water Management and Multi-Benefit Programs. The former position has been filled by Eric Koch, while the latter is still vacant. In addition, the IRWM Program lost key staff to the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) Program. This restructuring demonstrates DWR priorities on dam and flood safety, and SGMA.

Mr. Stadler also discussed other state-wide coordination efforts DWR. He acknowledged the end of Governor Jerry Brown's term. As Governor Brown's final term comes to a close, DWR will push to keep a strict deadline for the release of its California Water Plan (CWP) Update. Mr. Stadler participates in the DWR Implementation Coordination Workgroup, which consists of IRWM stakeholders and DWR Staff. The goal of the workgroup is to guide coordination of the implementation of stakeholder recommendations included in the *Stakeholder Perspectives: Recommendations for Sustaining and Strengthening Integrated Regional Water Management* (released by DWR in March 2017). The first meeting was held in December 2017 in Santa Barbara. The workgroup discussed how to better coordinate efforts to integrate IRWM into the next CWP Update. Lastly, Mr. Stadler discussed the Roundtable of Regions (RoR). The RoR is a voluntary group of representatives from each IRWM region in the state. The San Diego IRWM Region is part of the steering committee and helps to guide discussions. The RoR is currently working on formalizing leadership as a way to gain more influence with DWR.

Mr. Stadler outlined the Proposition (Prop) 1 Grant Program schedule. He emphasized that the current dates are tentative and are subject to change, especially because of the recent loss of IRWM Program staff. 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. The Call for Projects in the San Diego Region will take place in Fall 2018, after the release of the Final PSP and before Consultations with DWR. Mr. Stadler ended by highlighting the concern that potential bills do not include IRWM funding. There are plans for the San IRWM Region to analyze potential funding sources as a proactive step to keeping the IRWM Program funded.

San Diego IRWM Plan Update

Ms. Sarah Brower, City of San Diego, presented the work being done on the 2019 San Diego IRWM Plan Update (Plan Update). Ms. Brower reviewed the tentative schedule and workplan for the Plan Update, and the work previously presented to the RAC. The RAC provided input on the Region's Technical Development Areas (TDAs) in October 2017 and reviewed draft Disadvantaged Community (DAC) and Regional Water Supply Security definitions in December 2017. During this meeting, the RAC provided input on revisions to the Plan Objectives (Chapter 2) and Scoring Criteria (Chapter 9).

Ms. Brower provided a brief overview of the 2013 IRWM Plan Goals and Objectives to provide context for the revisions being presented during this meeting. Proposed revisions to the Objectives considered incorporation of RAC-identified TDA priorities and a Climate Change response. It is important to note that limited revisions were proposed to the Objectives to honor the intensive stakeholder-process used to develop these Objectives previously. The RAC was reminded of the TDA priorities that they identified in the October 2017 RAC meeting. An example of how these priorities were incorporated into an Objective was also presented. Ms. Brower then presented the Climate Change framework for the Plan Update. The initial framework was established in the 2013 IRWM Plan and will be built upon in the 2019 IRWM Plan Update. Definitions for climate resilience, climate adaptation, mitigation (climate), mitigation (of disaster risk and disaster), and vulnerability, were then linked back to the Objectives. A proposed revision elevates *Objective K: Effectively address climate change through GHG reduction, adaptation, or mitigation in water resource management* to *Goal 5: Enhance resiliency to climate change for regional water resources*. This revision serves to address the Climate Change mandate outlined in the 2016 IRWM Plan Guidelines and was a reasonable revision as Objective K addressed all climate change aspects laid out in the Climate Change Framework. All proposed revisions to the Objectives and the Climate Change Framework were provided to the RAC as handouts.

Ms. Brower then discussed proposed revisions to the Scoring Criteria. The Scoring Criteria are used for objective evaluation to separate projects into Tier 1 and Tier 2 for further consideration. Criteria are flexible and adapted to specific funding opportunity priorities. Proposed Criteria revisions 1) removed criteria that did not differentiate projects, 2) incorporated TDA priorities and Climate Change, and 3) revised language based on how criteria were applied in previous funding rounds. Three criteria remained unchanged, three criteria were removed, three criteria were revised, and three criteria were added. Ms. Brower solicited feedback on the "Involves More Than One Entity" criterion on how to define a "distinct partnership." Specifically concerning whether a partnership between two departments

within the same organization should be considered a true partnership or whether partners could only be two separate organizations. Proposed revisions to the Scoring Guidelines were also explained. These guidelines are the qualitative project selection considerations for the Project Selection Workgroup. The revisions removed specific dates in favor of timelines. For example, rather than considering whether a project was ready to proceed by December 2014, it would consider whether a project was ready to proceed by the “deadline established in the PSP...” An additional guideline “Realization of Benefits” was also included. All proposed revisions to the Scoring Criteria were provided to the RAC as a handout.

Questions/Comments:

- How does the new goal tie into the new scoring criteria?
 - The revised scoring criteria will address the new goal and specially calls out Climate Change concepts.
- Would a recycled water project be considered a strong project under this new goal? We can agree that it would reduce imports from the Bay Delta, which reduces energy needed to transport water long distances.
 - Yes, you’re right. The purpose of the goal is to build in a climate change perspective into all projects.
- I support the change. Will DWR be evaluating the Plan based on these Climate Change updates?
 - Yes, it was a top priority in the 2016 IRWM Plan Guidelines.
 - It is a DWR mandate to address climate change vulnerabilities, and this is how we are proposing to address that. There will be a separate criterion for Climate Change

Involve More than One Entity Criterion

- I believe two distinct partners means two different organizations. I am also concerned about the phrase “working jointly.” How do you address the issue of a superficial partnership? Is there a percentage of involvement threshold we should be considering?
 - Yes, we considered this and added a footnote [to the Scoring Criteria table] to distinguish between active partnership and passive support, which would not be considered a partnership. However, we did not apply specific percentages for partnerships.
- I like the footnote because it shows that a partnership considers “skin in the game.” Active engagement defines a partnership but showing a percentage could enhance scoring.
- In regard to the language for scoring four points saying that a project should have “at least 1 [partner] not previously awarded IRWM funding” – unless it is specifically required in the guidelines, I can’t support this revision. It doesn’t strengthen projects.
 - It is not specifically in the guidelines, but in the past DWR has pushed back on our ability to distribute funding more equally.
- If it’s mandated, then OK. If it’s not mandated, then I agree with the previous comment. It doesn’t make sense to include.
- I think financial partnerships should count, I don’t think it’s a negative thing. Some projects need that help. I think having these partnerships have been great. I’ve learned a lot by working with organizations that I don’t normally work with.
 - That’s great to hear.

- Maybe we should have a new criterion that considers spreading dollars around? Right now, it's just out of context.
- I like the sentiment of including more groups. Consider having a certain quota of projects that meet this "at least 1 not previously awarded" criterion. DAC leadership and empowerment, with more even distribution of power would be good.
 - Great point. The DAC criteria now includes capacity building for this very reason.

Resiliency to Climate Change Criterion

- How do we define high priority Climate Change adaptation? I want to know what we are committing to before approving a new criterion.
 - High priority Climate Change adaptation strategies are defined in Appendix 7-D of the 2013 IRWM Plan. It is part of the vulnerability assessment we conducted, which is now a requirement of the Plan Update.
- Did the RAC already approve the vulnerability prioritization?
 - Yes, it was done by the Climate Change Workgroup from the 2013 IRWM Plan. We will bring the Vulnerability Assessment to the next RAC meeting.
- Can we provide guidance on what is measurable/ways to calculate?
 - There is a table with metrics that are aligned with state priorities, which can be applied to the Climate Change criterion. We will provide this metrics table at the next RAC meeting.
- This seems more complicated. The intention is great, but how does this apply in the real world? The easier we can make this, the better. I think we need to remove the subjectivity from this. It can deter people from apply for grants.
- I agree. New organizations might be deterred as well.
 - We try to provide tools online on how project sponsors can quantify their projects, but it does take a lot of work.
- There needs to be some clarification.
 - A metrics table will help with this.
- I think the links were helpful the last time we applied for funding. I don't mind including specific Climate Change adaptation actions like carbon sequestration to the 4-point score.

Stormwater as a Resource Criterion

- For the 2-point score, can we change it from "Implements onsite capture and reuse" to "Implements onsite capture OR reuse"? Reuse is a specific type of project. We don't want to disincentivize good projects. Detention projects are good too.
 - Capture and infiltration are considered onsite use. And you're right, smart development has detention as an important piece.
- Isn't stormwater as a resource the same as reuse? I don't see the distinction.
 - We may want to rephrase as "use or reuse"
 - Are you actually using it as a resource or just capturing it and not letting it leave the site?
 - Isn't it always required?
 - It depends on the project, site, and sponsor.

- I think “and reuse” should be deleted because it’s already captured in the 4-point criterion “Utilizes stormwater as a resource.”
 - Yes, good point.

Optimizes Regional Infrastructure Criterion

- I think we should remove “regional” from the Criterion because we use the word “local” in the 2-point score.
 - Good point.
 - We propose to bring all these criteria back with responses to your comments.

General Criteria Comments

- I noticed you can score four points for all criteria. This implies equal value for each criterion.
 - The fourth column in the scoring criteria table is titled “Percent of Total Score.” We weight each criterion differently depending on DWR priorities for a given round of funding.

DAC Needs Assessment Update

Mr. Stadler presented an update on the DAC Needs Assessment. The development of definitions and mapping for disadvantaged communities (DACs), economically distressed areas (EDAs), underrepresented communities (URCs), and environmental justice (EJ) communities are underway and are taking place from November 2017 through March 2018. These definitions will apply to the entire funding area, which includes the Upper Santa Margarita and South Orange County Regions. DAC outreach and presentations will occur from March 2018 through September 2018. The Draft Regional DAC Needs Assessment is expected in the October-December 2018 timeframe.

The San Diego IRWM Program selected Rural Community Assistance Corporation (RCAC) and Climate Science Alliance to support the consulting team in the development of the DAC Needs Assessment. The team has experience working with DACs/EDA/URCs/EJ communities, specifically those communities who have not been involved in the IRWM program in the past. They will assist in identifying DAC organizations and outreaching to targeted DACs/EDA/URCs/EJ communities. Contracting is underway and the RAC will be kept updated as the project progresses.

Grant Administration

Ms. Loisa Burton, SDCWA, presented updates on grant administration. The IRWM Program has now funded 67 projects for a total of \$96.4 million. Currently \$53.1 million has been billed to DWR with 35 projects that are now complete or at least 80% complete. Ms. Burton highlighted projects from Prop 84-Round 1, Prop 84-Round 2, Prop 84-Round 3, and Prop 84-Round 4, including the Pilot Concrete Channel Infiltration Project, and the Conservation Home Makeover in Chollas Creek Watershed Project. The Sustaining Healthy Tributaries to Upper San Diego River (Project 5, Proposition 84-Round 2) is the Region’s first completed tribal project, which is a huge milestone. She read customer and DWR testament on various project successes.

The first progress report for Prop 1 Planning Grant was submitted in January 2018 and the first deliverable, Stormwater TM #1, was also submitted. The kickoff meeting and training for the DAC

Involvement Program grant was held in January 2018. The final DWR agreement is currently being processed.

Questions/Comments:

- How did funding work for Project 8 [Prop 1-Round 1]? Was it a reimbursement?
 - Yes, they were reimbursed.

Public Comments

The Floodplain Management Association is sponsoring the Southwest Extreme Precipitation Symposium on March 29th at UC San Diego. Visit their website at <http://www.floodplain.org/> for details.

Summary and Next Steps

Ms. Rosalyn Prickett, Woodard & Curran, presented current 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.

Project Types	Website
California State Coastal Conservancy	
<u>USFWS Wetlands Conservation Grant:</u> \$1M for coastal land acquisition; wetland restoration, enhancement, or management	Joel Gerwein External Grants Manager 510-286-4170 Joel.Gerwein@scc.ca.gov
USBR WaterSMART Programs (various)	
<u>Drought Resiliency Projects:</u> \$750K for projects that increase system flexibility and development of alternative supplies	https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/view-opportunity.html?oppId=298763
<u>Reservoir Operations Alternatives:</u> \$150K for economic effects of reservoir operations alternatives methodology (only 1 available)	https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/view-opportunity.html?oppId=299096
USBR Bay-Delta Restoration Program	
<u>CALFED Water Use Efficiency Grant:</u> \$3M for water use efficiency projects within the CALFED Solution Area (including western San Diego County)	https://www.grants.gov/view-opportunity.html?oppId=299930

Next RAC Meeting:

- April 4, 2017 – 9:00-11:30 am