



**Joint Scoring Workshop &
Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) Meeting #62**

June 1, 2016
9:00 am – 12:00 pm
San Diego County Water Authority Board Room
4677 Overland Avenue, San Diego, CA 92123

NOTES

Attendance

RAC Members

Ramin Abidi, City of San Diego (chair)
Ann Van Leer, Escondido Creek Conservancy
Ari Neumann for Olga Morales, RCAC
Arne Sandvik for Albert Lau, Padre Dam
Chris Helmer, City of Imperial Beach (and Alternate Joe Kuhn)
Chris Trees for Mike Thornton, SEJPA
Crystal Najera, City of Encinitas
Emily Fudge for Gloria Silva, Cleveland National Forest
Jennifer Hazard, Alter Terra
Joey Randall for Kimberly Thorner, Olivenhain Municipal Water District
John Flores, San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians
Julia Escamilla for Greg Thomas, Rincon del Diablo Municipal Water District
Kelly Craig for Robyn Badger, Zoological Society of San Diego
Kimberly O'Connell, University of California – San Diego Clean Water
Leigh Johnson, University of California Cooperative Extension
Mark Seits, Floodplain Management Association
Mark Stadler for Toby Roy, San Diego County Water Authority
Michael McSweeney, Building Industry Association
Phil Pryde, San Diego River Park Foundation

RWVG Staff and Consultants

Alexis Cahalin, RMC Water and Environment
Andrew Funk for Goldy Herbon, City of San Diego
Loisa Burton, San Diego County Water Authority
Mark Stephens, City of San Diego
Roselyn Prickett, RMC Water and Environment
Sally Johnson, RMC Water and Environment
Stephanie Gaines, County of San Diego
Vicki Kalkirtz, City of San Diego

Interested Parties to the RAC

Alex Heide, City of Poway
Alex Yescas, Harris and Associates
Amanda Sousa, San Diego Housing Commission
Anne Bamford, Industrial Environmental Association
Bob Leiter, UCSD
Chris Peregrin, CA State Parks
Colleen Foster, City of Oceanside
Dennis Davies, City of El Cajon
Eric Mosolgo, City of San Diego
Frances Kinney, Ocean Connectors
Helen Davies, City of Escondido
Jennifer Carroll, City of San Diego
John Holder, WILDCOAST
Juli Beth Hinds, UCSD
Karina Guevara, Harris and Associates
Lois Yum, City of San Diego
Lori Johnson, Yuima MWD/ Lazy H MWC
Luis Pelayo, City of Chula Vista
Maria Margarita Borja, City of San Diego
Martha Davis, City of San Diego
Mo Lahsaie, City of Oceanside
Paulina Lis, USGBC-SD
Rob Roy, La Jolla Band of Indians
Robin Rierdan, Lakeside River Park Conservancy
Sarah Hutmacher, San Diego River Park Foundation
Sheri McPherson, County of San Diego
Sheri Menelli, San Luis Rey Watershed
Tory Walker, TRWE
W. Gaters, SDG&E

Welcome and Introductions

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

Project Completion Report – Arne Sandvik, Padre Dam Municipal Water District

Mr. Arne Sandvik, Padre Dam Municipal Water District (Padre Dam MWD), presented on the Proposition 50, Project 4 – Ray Stoyer Water Recycling Facility Demonstration Project. Padre Dam MWD serves approximately 100,000 people. The goals of Padre Dam MWD's Indirect Potable Reuse (IPR) Program is to provide 15% (approximately 2,000 acre-feet per year [AFY]) of the potable supplies for its service area, keep the price under \$2,000 per acre-foot (AF), gain regulatory acceptance and requirements to implement a full scale IPR program, support Padre Dam MWD's strategic goal to increase water, wastewater, and energy independence, and reduce Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plan (WWTP) offloading requirement.

The IPR Program intends to use the aquifer as an environmental buffer, but may also extend to Lake Jennings for surface water augmentation in the future. 21 MGD of wastewater flow in the area would be converted to approximately 15 MGD of drinking water.

The demonstration project took one year for data collection, included 3 workshops with an expert panel, and engaged the State Water Resources Control Board's Division of Drinking Water (DDW). The project objectives were to shorten aquifer retention time and to demonstrate free chlorine's more effective pathogen reduction in comparison with using combined chlorine. To maintain protection of public health with the reduction in retention time, additional aboveground treatment and monitoring is needed. The Padre Dam MWD's advanced treatment train includes free chlorine, membrane filtration, reverse osmosis, ultraviolet light/advanced oxidation, and retention time in the aquifer. Free chlorine is a non-standard component of advanced treatment and substantially reduces viruses and bacteria. The NWRI Independent Advisory Panel approved a 5-log reduction credit for viruses using free-chlorine, allowing for a reduced residence time in aquifer.

Conclusions of the project showed that enhanced treatment provides control of all pathogens at the Advanced Water Purification Facility, monitoring provided on-line, continuous verification of treatment performance, and demonstrated a high degree of control of chemicals. The final report was submitted to DDW in May 2016. The results will serve as a basis for permitting future full-scale potable reuse projects, providing versatility for both groundwater and surface water projects.

Questions/Comments:

- What are you doing with the demonstration plant in the future?
 - Padre Dam MWD is continuing to run the facility and testing product (e.g., concentrating brine) through September. Future plans would be to continue to use it for Santee Lakes because total dissolved solids (TDS) is building up there.
- You showed a map of future locations of project components. Can you state where along the San Diego River it will be?
 - The project would be located along Highway 67, near the Willowbrook golf course and Riverside Avenue
- Is the facility up or downstream of Lakeside River Park?
 - It is upstream from the park.
- How is the cost effectiveness of this project? When we do projects like this, how does the information learned get out to the rest of the state?
 - The cost goal of this project was less than \$2,000/AF, and Padre Dam MWD is working towards it. We think that we'll be able to achieve this with the full-scale project. Compared to ocean desalination it is cost effective. IPR becomes cheaper than imported water around 2025.
 - Each project sponsored by an individual agency or organization. Sharing results of their projects is their responsibility. In the San Diego Region, the IRWM Program and RAC is one way we share that. We encourage people to share at professional organizations as well.

Offsite Alternative Compliance Program for Stormwater

Ms. Sheri McPherson, County of San Diego, and Mr. Eric Mosolgo, City of San Diego, presented on the offsite alternative compliance program for storm water. San Diego is now part of a regional MS4 permit that covers all of the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) Region 9. The goals of the MS4 permit are to allow copermitees to focus resources on improvement of water quality, and to incorporate strategies that encourage innovative and creative solutions.

Alternative compliance option Phase 1 became available in February 2016. Priority development projects require best management practices (BMPs) at every site. This is the onsite solution. Offsite alternative compliance is an offsite solution for projects that would otherwise not be able to meet the onsite requirements, but must provide additional benefits.

There are some requirements, including that offsite solutions be located in the same watershed as the project.

A water quality equivalency (WQE) translates requirements to allow off-site compliance and is needed to relate all projects. A WQE was developed over one year and the "credits" are calculated based on benefits to water quality and hydromodification. The WQE had to be approved by RWQCB, and was approved in December 2015. The credit system under the MS4 permit requires RWQCB approval of credit system.

The City of San Diego is using a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), specific to the City of SD to assist City staff in developing the specifics of the Phase 2 Offsite Storm Water Alternative Compliance Program. After development of the program, the City will get approval from RWQCB on the credit system. The final program (Phase 2) is anticipated to be available in July 2018.

WQE Guidance Documents can be found at www.waterboards.ca.gov/sandiego and www.projectcleanwater.org.

Questions/Comments:

- Building Industry Association (BIA) is excited about this because the new permit requires capture of all rain instead of releasing it after treatment. But in San Diego, soil is not good for infiltration. On-site BMPs do not address what has already been built. Infill is the future of development, but there is no room for on-site BMPs. These BMPs do not address pollution from previous development. ACP allows larger scale solutions. Gets more people involved.
- Don't you need a minimum set of BMPs on-site for development you are doing?
 - You still have on-site BMPs, but not structural ones. You have flow-through BMPs (mostly avoiding trash, large debris, etc.) which is less expensive.
- What if a scenario does not have place for an alternative compliance program (ACP)? What are other choices for developers?
 - The MS4 permit requires projects be located in the same watershed, but this is for the big watershed (for pollution control). There are more requirements for hydromodification. There have been discussion of going across watersheds, but it is not currently allowed under the permit.
- What are the challenges moving ahead for ACP taking off?
 - Challenges include the ability to use stream restoration projects for pollutant control (efficacy and legality questions) and developing a credit system with checks and balances

to ensure BMPs are maintained into perpetuity. This issues amplified when going off-site. Once market starts to move, should be a good process – challenges is getting started.

IRWM Planning Grant Solicitation

Ms. Stephanie Gaines, County of San Diego, discussed the IRWM Planning Grant solicitation. The RWMG recommends submitting a planning grant application to prepare a stormwater capture feasibility study; this study would have a total grant request of \$250,000.

The RAC voted for approval to submit the planning grant application for the preparation of a stormwater capture feasibility study.

DAC Planning Grant Solicitation

Mr. Mark Stadler, San Diego County Water Authority, presented on the DAC Planning Grant. There were a total of 22 projects submitted for consideration. Each project was scored by a third-party reviewer, and scores were released on May 25. The RAC took comments from the project sponsors and other interested parties. The RAC discussed the DAC Planning Grant projects.

Questions/Comments:

- Some projects meet more objectives but got the same points as ones that meet fewer. The Lakeside project (Project #1) should meet Objectives C and D but got no points for those. What projects get us the most bang for the buck? Some projects with a lot of value do not score high.
 - RAC approved the scoring at the previous RAC meeting. A RMC staffer who knows IRWM but does not work in San Diego scored the projects. She used what was in the applications. Sometimes it is not in the application, which is why we have this public comment period.
 - We have received some comments already. This is only the first step. The Project Selection Workgroup will look at projects, and have opportunity to elevate projects that may not have scored well but are considered good projects, so long as 2/3 of workgroup agrees with them. There are opportunities for this process to be qualitative instead of just quantitative.
- Looking at the numbers – we have \$4.1M total for the grants, but 2 projects use over \$2.8M of it. The RAC should discussion how to spread money around – do we want to have a lot of projects in many areas or focus on a few big ones and 2-3 small ones.
 - The Project Selection Workgroup is never under an obligation to provide the full funding request. Typically, grant awards for projects are reduced from the original request.
- To what extent do RAC members think we should have some big projects or lots of small projects? And how much do we want to focus on DAC communities vs. larger outside communities?
 - The RAC has an opportunity to provide guidance to the Project Selection Workgroup.
- There are lots of merit for projects from copermittees. Then compare that to CA State Parks, which has a large budget. Would like to keep funds in smaller agencies with fewer resources.
- DWR wants us to submit one project? Will you lump multiple projects all together to create “one” project?
 - We submit one application for the entire funding area, which will comprise multiple projects. Instead of region by region, we are doing funding area application. We will have

to get together with the Tri-County FACC to submit all projects for the San Diego, Upper Santa Margarita, and South Orange County regions.

The RAC took comments from the project sponsors and other interested parties.

Questions/Comments:

- Vicki Estrada, Groundwork San Diego (Project #3): Groundwork is focused on the Chollas Creek Watershed. Right before deadline, our major project partner had pulled out. We shifted the project to restore the creek between Federal Blvd. and Hwy 94. As a member of the Board of San Diego Canyonlands, I can say that Canyonlands is working on a similar project. Our project partners include the Webster Community Council and San Diego Habitat Conservancy. We did not have time to formalize these partnerships [before the deadline], but we clearly had other partners. We can re-do the application relative to the portion of who we are working with.
 - Reiterated Groundwork's comment; Groundwork appreciates the Project Selection Workgroup's consideration.
- Robin Rierdan, Lakeside River Park Conservancy (Project #1): When writing the application, neglected to acknowledge the data collection objective, but data collection is included in the project. The application wasn't clear about the project's future benefits. The wetland is located between the existing wellfield and the closed down wellfield (down gradient). The latter was closed because of groundwater contamination. This project will increase treatment and groundwater infiltration less than .25 mi from wellsite and within the cone of depression from when the wells were working. Wells closed because of groundwater contamination. As the project works it will increase clean water in the basin. As drought conditions continue, at some point the wells will be turned on. If they are turned on by Lakeside or the City of San Diego, this water is cheaper than imported water, and will benefits DACs. Lakeside Water District has one of the lowest water rates in the county because of its use of local supplies. Capturing groundwater is a viable use of grant money. There is an issue of structure, and this money is unusual money. Planning funds do not come around every day. For example, only 15% of any grant can be used for CEQA/Planning from the San Diego River Conservancy's Prop 1 funds. Permits are exhaustive, so having funds available allows you to leverage funds for this project more than funds that go to education (for example). If projects have CEQA completed you can access lots of other funds. For resource agency funding, you can only use 25% of the funds for planning/CEQA/administration. There is no other opportunity for getting funds for planning that would allow you to leverage other multi-million dollar funding sources for implementation. You are squandering resources if you do not use it to leverage other funds. Without the support of this funding opportunity, we cannot keep the wetland clean, and it will convert into scrub. We are happy to re-write the application to clarify points and look at our ability to leverage more public funds.
- Melanie Madrid, San Diego Housing Commission (Project #7): We submitted comments to Mark last night [May 31], but wanted to elaborate. The project was designed to create a plan that would address landscaping at public housing and affordable housing in City. It would directly benefit people and watersheds. During the drought, we eliminated irrigation but was left with dirt lots with problems with flooding and just unappealing. The project would benefit residents. Our score was hurt by a lack of partner, even though one was listed. Because it is a

subsidiary of the City, we lost points, but our partner was not part of the City. It is not a subsidiary of the City. Our partner is an affiliate of the City, but is a separate, stand-alone 501(3)c. We request that you please reconsider our score.

- John Holder, Wildcoast (project #4): Thank you for considering our project and recommending project. We are excited to develop the project. We bring experience in working with DACs and underserved communities. Thank you.
- Bob Leiter, UCSD (Project #15): It is important that everyone on the committee understands the projects. The focus of the proposal is developing project plans for specific DACs in San Diego Region. We have letters of support from the City of San Diego, City of Chula Vista, and City of Imperial Beach. Our project focuses on water conservation concepts in DACs. We did not specify neighborhoods because the civic engagement process would be the opportunity for stakeholders to weigh in on specific locations for pilot projects. Pilot projects would identify strategies for water conservation and reuse. The project will focus on urban neighborhoods and urban solutions. It will promote graywater use in new ways, stormwater capture, and UCSD had good partners to help (e.g., Scripps Institute of Oceanography). Public Health Alliance of Southern California will help evaluate public health issues of water reuse. The goal is not just good projects but also to answer important questions of public health and environmental issues of reuse, lay groundwork for moving forward with these projects, and share knowledge of urban water reuse management. It is really directly connected to direct coordination with these cities and entities, and is not just about UCSD. It is an opportunity to answer questions in those areas.
- Chris Peregrin, California State Parks (Project #19): Thank you for the favorable review. The Tijuana River Valley is an amazing resource and challenged with significant environmental issues (catastrophic flooding, sewage, and trash). This planning grant request is critically important to control polluting elements. The project will look at managing sediment, which is tied to wastewater, flooding, and trash flows in Tijuana River Valley. It is prioritized by the Tijuana River Valley Recovery Team. I would like to address concern about CA State Parks as an applicant. We are stepping forward as a leader to take responsibility for a project that needs to be done. CA State Parks may be perceived as having a huge budget, but this project is different. This project supports broad array of entities (City of SD, County, Imperial Beach, and others).
 - Some grant requests are large. Can you tell us how budget breaks down? There is \$800,000 for an EIR.
 - The budget we put together is scalable. The largest portion of the budget is for the EIR/EIS (\$800,000), but additional funds are needed for the project to be carried out. Additional budget is for the Tijuana River Valley Recovery Team (30 entities) to improve conditions in Tijuana River Valley. This group is bi-national, and it is hard to find funding for collaboration and coordination. We are also looking for support for a coordinator for this group; currently there is no dedicated allocation for that role. We could be more effective if we had a coordinator. Additional funds are requested to support staff and funding to manage the grant contract.
- Sheri Menelli (Project #5): I have probably have forgotten something when doing the application. Who are you going to pick for doing interviews? I'm beginning to realize

everyone's reasons and passions for their projects; it is maybe a good idea that everyone gets an interview so we can see what everyone is trying to do.

- Don't have time to interview everyone. Typically divide into Tier 1 (top 50%) and Tier 2. Some may be moved up into Tier 1. Then projects discussed in detail and questions answered by sponsors. July 12/13 for interview. Notified June 8 and 9 of interview.
 - More information to provide?
 - Any additional comments (these and written ones) will go to PSW. Please submit written comments to Rosalyn.
- Frances Kinney, Ocean Connectors (Project #6): Thank you for considering our application. I am honored to have the opportunity to address RAC. Our mission is to use migratory wildlife as case studies for environmental conservation and stewardship. We are located in National City, which is in the top 10% of zip codes statewide for environmental impacts. National City is identified as DAC. We are the only program for environmental education with youth in National City. We have on-going relationships with elementary schools in National City. We are requesting less funding than other organizations; we are accustomed to achieving good results with limited resources. The project is scalable. It will help engage 700 6th grade students in habitat restoration to reduce flooding, pollution/runoff, and increase access to educational programs. We can engage and empower National City residents to protect national resources.
 - Paulina Lis, U.S. Green Building Council (Project #22): Thank you. We operate as small and separate non-profit from the national Green Building Council organization. We scored a little lower because we did not include a project partner. Our proposed program focused on microloans for individuals and small businesses who are unable to invest in water efficient fixtures. The San Diego Metropolitan Credit Union is our partner to bring the program to a broader scale. We want to do our due diligence and research before identifying specific location/partners. This is aimed to be pilot project that is scalable.
 - Colleen Foster, City of Oceanside (Project #5): Thank you. This project is to improve impacts on homeless in watershed. It will help solve water quality (trash, etc.) and homeless issues. The pilot study will incorporate and integrate a taskforce for representatives of the homeless task force. It will implement various strategies while helping to serve these populations. Traditionally, we do cleanups and code enforcement patrols, but if we do not provide resources, areas are impacted within days. Within the study area, our data shows 520 tons of trash were removed in 2015. This is inadequate; there is still excess trash and materials because of lack of access to resources. The study will investigate options and new approaches to provide resources in an effective way.
 - Helen Davis, City of Escondido (Project #8) – Thank you for your consideration. This project is important to City of Escondido and a priority for our organization. It is in the center of the city and will benefit a DAC. Currently it is the only unlined channel that drains to Escondido Creek within the Escondido watershed. This creek is a precious resource we wish to rehabilitate and restore to improve watershed and water quality. It will also help revitalize this area of the City. It will be complicated due to existing infrastructure so it requires careful planning. It will contribute to bringing real change and real improvements.

- Lori Johnson, Lazy H Mutual Water Company (Project #20): This project is located in the Pauma Valley (Tier 2 on project list). Lazy H Mutual Water Company (MWC) is a small MWC which serves 40 residences, 1 motel, and 1 restaurant. We are struggling with an aging population, trying to get board members, and aging infrastructure. I am not a grant writer. Lazy H MWC needs help in designing a system so they can dissolve the MWC and merge with Yuima Water District. Water levels are very low in Lazy H's existing wells. There are 6 MWC in the area, 3 of them have water quality issues for nitrates; these MWCs qualify for Clean Water SRF funds, but Lazy H does not. They do not have the funds to come forward to have a study done to improve their system to install infrastructure to merge with Yuima Water District. I may have forgotten to check some boxes and lost points that way. We lost points for not directly benefitting DACs, but I am not sure how the scoring worked. It looked like it served a DAC on the map. The residents are over 50% Hispanic; the rest are retired and on fixed incomes.
 - No points for directly benefitting DACs.
 - Not sure how it worked. It looked like it did on the map. Residents are over 50% Hispanic; rest is retired on fixed income.
- Lori Johnson, Yuima Municipal Water District (Project #17): – In 2014, the Governor signed Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). Through outreach, which involved 5 tribes, 5 municipal water districts, and 6 mutual water companies, along with other areas dependent on groundwater, the community decided they wanted to manage the basin locally. The problem is getting the parties together. We want to manage the basin locally and in a sustainable manner. But they had to figure out how to pay for the groundwater management plan. It is a phased project. Stakeholder outreach still being completed, and we are working on how to bring tribes into the equation and meet requirements of SGMA. The project represents a possibility to get funds into small rural communities.
- Ann Van Leer, Escondido Creek Conservancy (project #18): The project scored high for multiple objectives, but missed the direct benefits of the project to DACs. There was confusion over whether the project was addressing just the DAC or the whole watershed. Our perspective is at the watershed level. We have a 7 mile long concrete channel in Escondido. To do anything meaningful, we need to look at the entire watershed. We appreciate the time everyone has spent on this, and we are happy to provide more information.
- Julia Escamilla, Rincon Del Diablo Municipal Water District (Project #13): There was a miscommunication between staff; we do have project partners (City of Escondido, and a resources conservation district). Our project will determine and plan for retrofits for communities that cannot afford the transition.

RAC Caucus Breakout Groups discussed the projects in further detail and determined important types of projects needed for their caucus category.

Water Supply Caucus: Recommends rescoring projects with additional submitted information/documentation. Watershed planning is important, look at entire watershed as a whole. Project #18 (Escondido Creek Conservancy) lost points because it considered the entire watershed, but it should be reconsidered. Recommend elevating Project #17 (Yuima MWD) into Tier 1, and recommend reconsidering Project #13 (Rincon del Diablo MWD).

Water Quality Caucus: Multiple benefits should be taken into consideration. Objectives G and H are important from a water quality perspective. Projects #3 (Groundwork) and #5 (Oceanside – San Luis Rey) met the water quality objectives. Projects #8 (City of Escondido), #10 (City of El Cajon), #11 (City of Chula Vista), #12 (City of National City), and #19 (CA State Parks) are all DAC planning projects with a water quality focus. Most of the projects with clear water quality benefits are already in Tier 1, but the caucus recommends Project #3 (Groundwork) be elevated to Tier 1.

Natural Resources Caucus: Some projects satisfy more objectives than others, which should be considered. The caucus focused on the Tier 2 projects and recommends that additional information should be used to guide the Workgroup's consideration of individual projects. The Lakeside project (#1) should be elevated to Tier 1 because it has wider range of benefits (water quality, San Diego River Watershed, and DAC benefits). The Lakeside Project should be considered high priority and the caucus would like the Workgroup to consider additional information provided by the project sponsor. Projects with benefits to a wider area should be a higher priority. Escondido Creek project (#18) should also be moved to Tier 1 because it complements the WQIP. Water quality improvement in a watershed with DACs helps address all objectives.

DAC/EJ Caucus: The Workgroup should consider the degree to which DAC/EJ/EDAs/Underrepresented Communities benefit from the project. Shelf-ready documents (CEQA, design drawings, etc.) and the degree to which the project leads to implementation should be a priority. Projects that should be elevated to Tier 1 include #17 (Yuima MWD) and #20 (Lazy H) because they directly benefit DAC/EJ. Planning grant money specifically for DACs is rare and is needed by DAC communities to implement projects. The Workgroup should consider the cost-benefit ratio of projects.

Other Caucus: Integrated flood projects are a priority, as well as projects that lead to implementation and provide integrated solutions. The City of Escondido (#8), Escondido Creek (#18), Groundwork - Chollas Creek (#3), and Lakeside (#1) projects should be elevated to Tier 1. The Workgroup should consider whether projects that have other funding sources would be implemented with or without this grant compared to projects that do not have other funding sources and would not be implemented without this grant. In future rounds, we should require written confirmation/verification (memo, etc.) of partnerships.

Summary and Next Steps

The Project Selection Workgroup will be meeting to discuss the DAC Planning Grant projects in further detail. Projects will be selected for interviews and the workgroup will select projects for the DAC Planning Grant.

Project Selection Workgroup Meetings:

- June 7, 2016
- June 8, 2016
- July 15, 2016

Project Interviews:

- July 13, 2016
- July 14, 2016

Next RAC Meeting:

- August 3, 2016 – 9-11:30am

2016 Meeting Schedule:

- August 3, 2016
- October 5, 2016
- December 7, 2016