



**Regional Advisory Committee
Meeting #27 Notes**

June 2, 2010, 9:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
San Diego County Water Authority
4677 Overland Avenue, San Diego, CA 92123

Attendance

RAC Members

Kathleen Flannery, County of San Diego (chair)
Anne Bamford, Industrial Environmental Association
Craig Adams, San Dieguito River Valley Conservancy
Dave Harvey, Rural Communities Assistance Corporation
Eric Larson, Farm Bureau San Diego County
Iovanka Todt, Floodplain Management Association
Jennifer Kovecses, San Diego CoastKeeper
Charlotte Pienkos, The Nature Conservancy
Mark Stadler for Ken Weinberg, San Diego County Water Authority
Kirk Ammerman, City of Chula Vista
Linda Flournoy, Planning and Engineering for Sustainability
Lisa Gover, Campo Kumeyaay Nation
Richard Walker, City of Escondido
Jeff Pasek for Marsi Steirer, City of San Diego
Megan Cooper, California Coastal Conservancy
Bill Hunter, Santa Fe Irrigation District
Maggie Houlihan, City of Encinitas
Richard Pyle, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce
Rob Hutsel, San Diego River Park Foundation

Non-Voting Members

Amy Campbell for Greg Kryzs, United States Bureau of Reclamation

RWVG Staff

Loisa Burton, San Diego County Water Authority
Sheri McPherson, County of San Diego

Interested Parties to the RAC

Anna Aljabiry, California Department of Water Resources
Heather Parkison, RMC Water and Environment
Jane Davies, Sweetwater Authority
Robyn Badger, Zoological Society of San Diego
Dianne Kilwein, Valley Center Municipal Water District
Roshan Sirimanne, unknown
Paul Hartman, City of Vista
Kristen Crane, City of Poway

Laura Carpenter, Brown & Caldwell
Rosalynd Stewart, RMC Water and Environment

Introductions

Ms. Kathleen Flannery (chair), County of San Diego, welcomed everyone to the meeting. Introductions were made around the room.

San Diego IRWM Updates

DWR Update

Anna Aljabiry, California Department of Water Resources (DWR), explained that DWR is considering lowering the Planning Grant funding match to 25% or 30%, but also lowering the cap to an amount less than \$1 million. Ms. Aljabiry informed the RAC that the grant cycles will be staggered: Planning Grant first and Implementation Grant second. Additionally, the release date for the final proposal solicitation packages (PSPs) has been delayed until late July.

Ms. Aljabiry then explained DWR's invoice review process, which takes a minimum of two to six months until a check is issued. Ms. Aljabiry has the ability to expedite her approval of an invoice, but beyond that point, there is little that can be done to hurry along further approvals or issuance of payment. Furthermore, no additional invoices will be processed until the 2011 fiscal year budget passes.

Questions and Comments:

- Will we still have 60 days after release of the Implementation Grant PSP to submit our grant application?
 - Yes, although the timeline may shift drastically. The Planning and Implementation PSPs will all be released on the same day in late July. Planning Grant applications will be submitted first (8 weeks after release), followed by Implementation Grant applications (10-12 additional weeks). If PSPs are released at the end of July, the Planning Grant application will be due in late September and the Implementation Grant application will be due in December or January. The Prop 1E cycle will be staggered in the same manner, following the Prop 84 Implementation cycle.
 - For those applying for Prop 1E funds, the project must be in the San Diego IRWM Project Database, but SDCWA does not need to submit on behalf of the region.
 - Project Selection Workgroup dates will shift with the timeline.
- Will a summary of all comments submitted to DWR on the draft PSPs be prepared?
 - Yes, but it may not be released to the public.
- Were the public comments generally in line with San Diego's concerns?
 - Yes, most comments were in regard to cost share and the timeline.
- If the cost share is lowered for the Planning Grant, it will mean more regions may apply and therefore less money may be available to San Diego.
- Will DWR defer to the IRWM Regions regarding project recommendations?
 - Yes, recommendations of the San Diego IRWM Region will be seriously considered by DWR. DWR will honor Tri-County FACC agreement regarding funding allocation within the Funding Area.
- Loan interest is not reimbursable. Would DWR recommend waiting until the end of the year to avoid interest during budgeting process?

- Yes, it would be better to wait until the 2011 fiscal year budget is passed to incur additional costs associated with the grant.

Proposition 50 Update

Ms. Loisa Burton, San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA), announced that all Local Project Sponsor (LPS) contracts have been distributed. Delays were due to contract changes. Several project amendments have been submitted for DWR review, and SDCWA expects to receive their approval soon. While approximately \$1.4 million has been invoiced to date, \$571,000 has been received and SDCWA is awaiting one more payment of approximately \$200,000. Finally, Ms. Burton reminded the RAC that the third round of invoices and progress reports will be due on July 15th, and encouraged all projects to continue submitting invoices to maintain the flow of the invoice process.

San Diego IRWM Updates

Ms. Rosalyn Stewart, RMC Water and Environment, reviewed the group discussion from RAC Meeting #26 about Water and Land Use Coordination. Important takeaways from the discussion included maintaining open dialogue among water agencies and land use authorities during the discretionary review process; coordinating with developers and utilities for timing of capital improvements; and hosting meetings and forums to facilitate this coordination. Ms. Stewart reminded the RAC that these takeaways will be incorporated into the IRWM Plan Update.

Ms. Stewart discussed the anticipated timeline for the Planning Grant cycle. She explained that the region must begin scoping for the Planning Grant application and will come back in August with suggestions for the IRWM Plan Update. Scoping for the IRWM Plan Update is expected to take approximately 5-6 weeks, followed by RAC approval and then SDCWA Board approval. Finally, the Planning Grant application is expected to take 6-8 weeks.

Ms. Stewart explained that DWR anticipates three rounds of Prop 84 funding for implementation projects. Projects submitted to the Project Database by June 30th will be considered for Prop 84 Round 1 funding. However, given DWR's schedule modifications, the RAC may consider extending the Call for Projects through the end of July. The Call for Projects announcement has been widely distributed, but RAC members are encouraged to distribute it further throughout their own networks. Targeted outreach to disadvantaged community and tribal representatives is taking place as well. The Call for Projects is expected to be open for approximately 6-8 weeks, followed by 1 week of project ranking and scoring. This scoring and ranking is based on how the project contributes to regional goals and objectives, integrates multiple water management strategies, provides multiple benefits, benefits the entire region, synergizes with other projects, benefits disadvantaged communities, addresses environmental justice needs, builds upon other local and regional planning efforts, and fosters partnerships among entities. Ranking will be followed by 3 weeks for watershed group review, 3-4 weeks for the Project Selection Workshop, and then RAC approval and SDCWA Board approval. Finally, the Implementation Grant application is expected to take 10-12 weeks.

The draft Project Guide (handout) was based on DWR's draft Implementation Grant PSP. The Project Guide explains how projects will be scored and ranked per the San Diego IRWM Plan, as well as what the anticipated contracting and matching funds requirements are. A final version will be distributed after DWR releases the final Implementation Grant PSP.

Ms. Stewart reminded the RAC that the online Project Database allows stakeholders to add and edit projects for inclusion in the IRWM Plan list. Other submitted projects and integration

opportunities can be seen using the Map View or the search function. The Project Database will remain open to project submissions beyond deadlines for each round, so that projects may be submitted after the deadline for consideration in future rounds.

Ms. Stewart announced that two Project Workshops will be held from 6-8pm on June 14th in Encinitas and June 15th in Chula Vista to encourage project submittal and discuss integration opportunities. RAC members are urged to have staff from their organizations present at these workshops. The announcement for these workshops has also been distributed in electronic form.

Watershed Group Review

Mr. Rob Hutsel, San Diego River Park Foundation, explained that Watershed Groups will be given an opportunity to review and comment on the submitted projects. The Watershed Groups will use a form to provide comments, preferably related to how the project conforms with the local watershed management plan. The Watershed Groups will return comments to the Project Selection Workgroup by the end of August.

Project Selection Workgroup

Ms. Sheri McPherson explained the Project Selection Workgroup's composition and structure, identical to the one convened for Prop 50. The Project Selection Workgroup is comprised of representatives from the following groups: 3 RWMG members, 1 water retailer, 1 water quality, 2 watershed/natural resource, and 1 at-large member. The Workgroup ground rules (handout) will be updated for Prop 84. The Workgroup will begin meeting once the scoring and ranking and watershed group reviews have been completed.

Ms. McPherson went on to present a list of Program Preferences and Statewide Priorities. Ms. McPherson suggested that the criteria on that list be used as a baseline for Prop 84 project evaluation. The descriptions of Statewide Priorities appear as check boxes in the Project Database so that it is clear which criteria a project meets.

Questions and Comments:

**RAC
Decision**

- Suggestion to extend the Call for Projects to Monday August 2, 2010.
 - **Agreement by RAC to extend Call for Projects to Monday August 2, 2010.**
- How were the Watershed Groups selected?
 - The San Diego IRWM program welcomes participation by any and all watershed groups. The Project Guide Appendix includes a list of all known watershed groups we are reaching out to – others will be gladly accepted.
- Could the list of Watershed Groups please be distributed?
 - Yes. An invitation to comment for the Watershed Groups will be distributed to the entire RAC.
- Need to clarify how and where Salt/Nutrient Management Plans may fit into the Planning Grant application.
- Need to review draft IRWM Plan Standards against our IRWM Plan to determine where synergies are – not change direction established for the region.
 - In contrast, we may need to expand our regional planning to address new needs.
 - The old IRWM Plan should guide the formation of the new IRWM Plan Update, hopefully helping find weaknesses.
- Project Selection Workgroup review should focus on meeting the Regional Objectives in our adopted IRWM Plan.

- Criteria should also include numeric contributions to the Plan metrics.
- Once the list of projects is narrowed down to the selected projects, the pool of funds will be divvied up appropriately among the projects.
- How do the Program Preferences and Statewide Priorities fit into the scoring criteria?
 - Suggestion to use giant table to crosswalk Statewide Priorities and IRWM Plan Objectives, indicating which will be used in ranking.
- Local project sponsors are encouraged to work together. The Map View and search function in the database allows other users to look for projects near them or projects that match key words. Project sponsors should use these tools and also be sure to submit projects, so that others can see projects compatible with their own.
- Request for more direction as to how Prop 1E projects will submit for funding, specifically whether these projects will need RAC approval or not.

Floodplain Management in IRWM Planning

Ms. Iovonka Todt, Floodplain Management Association, and Ms. Anna Aljabiry, DWR, presented on floodplain management in the IRWM program. Stormwater and flood management projects can be funded through either Prop 84 or Prop 1E. Local project sponsors should choose how the project relates to one of the propositions and explain how the project meets DWR's guidelines for that proposition. All submitted projects must be multi-benefit and all grants required a funding match.

Water code Section 10530 et seq (IRWM Planning Act) includes floodplain management as an eligible project or program; states that IRWM Plans must consider California Water Plan resource management strategies (which includes flood risk management); and establishes flood control agencies as stakeholders in IRWM Plan development and implementation. Flood risk management includes structural components, land use, disaster preparedness, response, recovery, flood plain function restoration, and flood plain regulation. There have been changes in the IRWM Guidelines to incorporate the integration of flood management as a Statewide Priority. Flood management should be considered in the Region Description, Resource Management Strategies, and Stakeholder Involvement sections of the IRWM Plan Update. There is consideration of specific grants for the purpose of integrating flood management, but such grants are currently conceptual and may not crystallize until 2011. Coinciding with the floodplain management facet of IRWM planning, the California Water Plan's implementation plan contains an objective to practice integrated flood management and implement FloodSAFE, is a Statewide flood management planning program.

Questions and Comments:

- The San Diego region has decentralized flood control districts, so we do have a need for regional flood management coordination and planning. We are investigating whether we want to do that with the Prop 84 Planning Grant. Is there a suggestion how to do it that will open the region up for more grants (since the cap will be lowered)?
 - If the San Diego Region applies for Prop 84 Planning Grant funds, the region will have another opportunity to apply for new funding as those programs are rolled out. It is recommended that if the region is ready, it should apply for funding now rather than wait.

- Are we only addressing floodplain management to the extent of dealing with flood waters in the lower watershed? Or are we also addressing management and prevention of flooding in the middle and upper watersheds?
 - The bond language says “Flood Management” or “Flood Risk Management” so activities are not limited to the lower floodplain.
 - More explicit language would be helpful so that applicants know how to address sites higher in the watershed.
- How can we address the homeless living along our rivers and causing human health issues?
 - Projects which address flood management and disadvantaged communities (which the homeless are) would score higher.

Salinity/Nutrient Management Planning in the San Diego Region

Michael Welch, PhD, consultant to the SDCWA and Southern California Salinity Coalition (SCSC), gave a presentation explaining the proposed Salinity/Nutrient Management Planning Guidelines for the San Diego region. Dr. Welch opened by explaining that the State Water Resources Control Board established a Recycled Water Policy in order to encourage recycled water use. This Recycled Water Policy establishes that “...the appropriate way to address salt and nutrient issues is through the development of regional or subregional salt and nutrient management plans rather than through imposing requirements solely on individual recycled water projects.” With this in mind, Dr. Welch discussed the potential salinity/nutrient sources including fertilizer applications, recycled water, municipal wastewater, upstream contributions, other applied waters, septic tanks, and in large part, applied imported water. Dr. Welch explained that the Recycled Water Policy requires that salinity/nutrient management plans shall be completed for each basin using a stakeholder driven process, address salinity/nutrient loads and the means to best manage the loads, and be completed by the Regional Board by 2014. The Regional Board is encouraging local agencies and stakeholders to develop the required salinity/nutrient plans.

On the local level, Mr. Welch explained that interested stakeholders have held several workshops with the SDCWA, SCSC, and the Regional Board to assess salinity management requirements and issues in the San Diego region. These workshops concluded that there has been a significant degree of salinity management and assessment in the region, but there is a lack of Regional Board funding for the preparation of salinity/nutrient management plans. Furthermore, the workshops determined that local agencies could benefit from preparing their own salinity/nutrient management plans, including: influencing the Basin Plan objectives, protecting groundwater quality, increasing groundwater yield, enhancing recycled water use opportunities and addressing recycled water compliance issues. The workshops also concluded that the level of effort for salinity/nutrient management plans should be tailored to the size or use of the aquifer, that regional guidelines would be helpful, and that there is a need for some form of regional coordination. Follow-up actions included: outreach to promote stakeholder involvement; coordination with the Regional Board; and development of tentative guidelines for preparing salinity/nutrient management plans in the region.

The draft Salinity/Nutrient Management Planning Guidelines provide the following important information: identify the tasks required to complete the plans; provide guidance on identifying constituents of concern; identify aquifer types applicable to salinity/nutrient management plans;

and establish recommended levels of effort on basis of basin size and complexity—for which Dr. Welch proposed a tiered approach into which identified basins in the region would fall. Dr. Welch also presented a list of tasks that the draft Salinity/Nutrient Management Planning Guidelines outline for preparation of each individual basin plan.

Finally, Dr. Welch discussed the progress to date in the area of Salinity/Nutrient Management Planning in the region. As he discussed earlier in the presentation, initial regional workshops have been completed, informal coordinating committees have been established, regional constituents of concern have been identified, initial draft proposed guidelines have been developed, initial basin classification and prioritization has been established, and initial stakeholder review of draft guidelines has occurred. Upcoming progress should include: Regional Board review and approval of the proposed guidelines, continued SDCWA/SCSC/Regional Board coordination to encourage stakeholder interest, funding opportunities, agency/stakeholder action to move forward with plans in selected basins, and Regional Board action to address Recycled Water Policy compliance in other areas of the region.

Questions and Comments:

- Salinity/Nutrient Management Planning seems to be multi-benefit because it incorporates many different facets of water management.
- How does Salinity/Nutrient Management Planning Guidelines address beneficial uses for environmental uses?
 - The Basin Plan does not address environmental beneficial uses for groundwater, but rather limits environmental beneficial uses to surface water. However, an expansion concurrent with the Salinity/Nutrient Management Planning effort is possible.
- Recycled water gets into groundwater in a number of ways: recharge, injection, irrigation. Are they all covered?
 - Yes, they are addressed during source identification.
- Who is SCSC? What effort is being put forth to incorporate other stakeholders beyond water supply and recycled water?
 - SCSC is a coalition of water supply agencies; SDCWA is a member.
 - The RAC and the public are invited to get involved. The next meeting is a workshop with the Region Board, to be held on June 15th at 1pm at SDCWA.
- Do Salinity/Nutrient Management Plans get incorporated into the Basin Plan?
 - That depends on what the Salinity/Nutrient Management Plan recommends regarding management strategies – if beneficial uses or water quality objectives are recommended for change, then a Basin Plan amendment is necessary.
 - The Regional Board’s approval process is not clear yet either.
- Are flood managers involved in Salinity/Nutrient Management Planning effort? It would build on capture/recharge to dilute groundwater supply.

Scoping for IRWM Planning Grant

Ms. Stewart explained that the Planning Grant would cover the IRWM Plan Update, as well as new or focused planning such as integration of flood management issues or salt/nutrient management planning (which would be incorporated into the IRWM Plan Update as attachments). Ms. Stewart asked attendees if these would be appropriate topics for the RAC to

discuss including in the Planning Grant application or if there should be others. Ms. Stewart also restated that the IRWM Plan Standards contain several new chapters and stressed that four to five additional sections will include takeaways from previous RAC discussions.

Questions and Comments:

- Do we want to see funding available for Salinity/Nutrient Management Planning?
 - This may not be ready for the RAC to support it. It seems some stakeholders have not yet been included in review of guidelines. Need to explore regional coordination.
- Suggested topics to be covered in the Planning Grant scope:
 - Future governance of San Diego IRWM program
 - Climate change
 - Policy Issues/Dynamic Legal Environment
 - Water supply, source diversification
 - Planning Analytical Level
 - How to gather, handle, and analyze information/data
 - What tools do we need to do planning (knowledge, decision making tools)
 - Monitoring of projects – how successful have they been
 - Needs and issues of disadvantaged communities
 - Watershed planning
 - Green waste management related to infiltration

Next RAC Meeting

Our next RAC meeting will be held on Wednesday August 4, 2010 from 9:00am to 11:30am at SDCWA's Board Room.