



Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) Meeting #63

August 3, 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

Dana Frieauf, San Diego County Water Authority (chair)
Albert Lau, Padre Dam
Ann Van Leer, Escondido Creek Conservancy
Bill Hunter, Santa Fe Irrigation District
Bob Kennedy, Otay Water District
Brian Olney, Helix Water District
Casey Anderson for Eric Larson, San Diego County Farm Bureau
Chris Helmer, City of Imperial Beach
Chris Trees for Mike Thornton, SEJPA
Crystal Najera, City of Encinitas
Greg Thomas, Rincon del Diablo Municipal Water District
Jennifer Hazard, Alter Terra
Jennifer Sabine, Sweetwater Authority
James Peugh for Phil Pryde, San Diego River Park Foundation
Joey Randall for Kimberly Thorner, Olivenhain Municipal Water District
John Flores, San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians (and alternate Rob Roy, La Jolla Band of Indians)
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 (and alternate S. Wayne Rosenbaum), Building Industry Association
Olga Morales, RCAC
Patrick Crais, California Landscape Contractors Association
Robyn Badger, Zoological Society of San Diego
Ronald Wootton, Buena Vista Lagoon Foundation
Travis Pritchard, San Diego Coastkeeper

RWMG Staff and Consultants

Andrew Funk for Goldy Herbon, City of San Diego
Bill Luksic, San Diego County Water Authority
George Adrian, City of San Diego
Jen Sajor, RMC Water and Environment
Loisa Burton, San Diego County Water Authority
Mark Stadler, 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
Helen Davies, City of Escondido
Jeff Stephenson, San Diego County Water Authority
Jennifer Carroll, City of San Diego
Jane Fajardo, City of San Diego
Janice Duvall, San Diego County Office of Education
Lauma Willis, Department of Water Resources – Southern Region Office
Leland Womack, Tory R. Walker Engineering
Maria Margarita Borja, City of San Diego
Martha Davis, City of San Diego
Michael Sims, California Rural Water Association
Michelle Shumate, San Diego County Water Authority
Reed Thornberry, City of San Marcos
Sheri Menelli, San Luis Rey Watershed
Willie Gaters, SDG&E

Welcome and Introductions

Ms. Dana Frieauf, San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA), welcomed everyone to the meeting. Introductions were made around the room.

Project Completion Report – Reed Thornberry, City of San Marcos

Mr. Reed Thornberry, City of San Marcos, presented on the Proposition 50, Project 3 – Campus Landscape Renovation, Conservation and Pollutant Load Reduction. The original scope of the project included reducing irrigation runoff through the improved water use efficiency at eight pilot sites located within the Carlsbad Watershed in San Diego County. The objective was to provide measurable water conservation and water quality benefits and to demonstrate the link between over-irrigation reductions and associated reductions in pollutant loads. Between 2012 and 2014, three project amendments were approved. The final amendment, approved on August 4, 2014, included major changes to the scope of work and a project sponsor change from the City of Encinitas to the City of San Marcos.

The final project scope included the landscape areas along San Marcos Boulevard in front of the City of San Marcos Civic Center. The Civic Center is located within the San Marcos Hydrographic Area of the Carlsbad Watershed Management Area and is a primary public facility located at a core transportation hub. Project elements included planning, design work, implementation, water quality and flow monitoring data analysis, and public outreach and education. A Dry Weather Study, which identified irrigation as a major stormwater flow source, provided the basis for project planning. In 2013, the final concept and design packages were completed and construction was approved in June 2015. Construction began on November 30, 2015 and was completed in March 2016. Landscaped turf grass was replaced with water-wise plants. Two-foot wide stabilizing decomposed granite borders were also installed to collect overspray and reduce runoff.

Pre- and post- construction water quality data were compared and results showed a 100% reduction in pollutant load as irrigation runoff was completely eliminated. However, the project's target of a 20% water-use reduction is still being analyzed.

Questions/Comments:

- Was it possible to tell if it was your flows in the Dry Weather Study?
 - The study was watershed wide, so it was overall.
- Was the City irrigating this area with recycled water originally?
 - No, the area is irrigated with well water. Groundwater is an imported resource to maintain. The contact with turf grass led to pollutant loading.
- Did you look at the source of bacteria given well water?
 - We looked at the water quality after it was applied to the turf grass. Not sure if we test well water for bacteria. We wanted to apply water to see if there was runoff, and then we tested that.
- Who was the original grant application sponsor? Can funding still be approved even if sponsor changes?
 - It's okay to amend projects to have different sponsors as long as the objectives and the general area of the project remain the same. The original sponsor was the City of Encinitas and Mira Costa College, but the funding match fell through. These amendments go through a formal process with the State.

Project Completion Report – Lesley Dobalian, San Diego County Water Authority

Ms. Lesley Dobalian, SDCWA, presented on the Proposition 50, Project 5 – Recycled Water Retrofit Assistance Program. The goal of the project was to improve water supply reliability, reduce dependency on imported water, and create a drought-resilient supply by supporting the expansion of recycled water use. Though recycled water retrofits are a small fraction of infrastructure costs, these costs are borne by the customer and vary between \$10,000 and \$100,000 per site. The project addresses this issue by providing financial assistance for retrofits to facilitate recycled water conversions. The project intended to reimburse all or a portion of reasonable costs for the retrofit work. Retrofit work eligible for reimbursement included preparation of as-built drawings of irrigation systems, replacement of hose bib, installation of recycled water distribution pipelines, and tagging and labeling of irrigation control equipment.

Three amendments to the project resulted in a reduction in the number of sites from 40 to 20, and an increase in maximum funding to \$75,000 and up to 30 acres per site, and an extension of the project completion date to 2016. The project encountered major challenges including increased construction and permitting costs and site selection process delays.

The project went from June 2008 to April 2016, with project costs, including matching funds, totaling to \$2.2 million. It successfully provided direct financial assistance for 15 retrofit sites and expansion projects, resulting in an offset of imported water demands of approximately 400 acre-feet per year (AFY). Major beneficiaries of the project were the City of Oceanside (\$300,000), Poway Unified School District (\$50,000), Olivenhain Municipal Water District (\$50,000), the City of San Diego (\$157,727), and the City of Del Mar (\$212,805).

Questions/Comments:

- What were the savings to HOAs? How did they benefit?
 - We are not sure as this project was just completed. We can get you that information soon, and it will also be in the Project Completion Report. HOAs were excited to be part of the project, but it was challenging to meet all the grant requirements.

Project Completion Report – Jack Bebee, Fallbrook Public Utility District

Mr. Jack Bebee, Fallbrook Public Utility District, presented on the Proposition 50, Project 10 – Santa Margarita Conjunctive Use Project, Phase 1. The project was a joint endeavor between the United States Bureau of Reclamation, USMC Camp Pendleton (Camp Pendleton), and Fallbrook Public Utility District (FPUD). More than 95% of Camp Pendleton’s water supply is local, flash flows from the Santa Margarita River. In order to increase water supply reliability, the project aimed to improve diversion and effectively capture additional flows from large storm events. Elements of the project were environmental permitting, hydrological modeling, water rights settlements, and the feasibility and final design of FPUD facilities. It also included the construction and design of inflatable weirs that would divert and direct water to spreading grounds for groundwater infiltration.

One major challenge involved the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s (NOAA) Steelhead Recovery Plan (Plan). In order to comply with the Plan, the project had to incorporate reduced diversion rates and a fish passage facility, which added an additional two years to the project timeline. Upon completion, the new diversion system was able to capture 3,800 AFY of additional local water.

Questions/Comments:

- How do you capture water without a dam?
 - Instead of backing water up behind a dam, the project diverts flows and uses it for groundwater recharge.
- In large flows do you deflate the weirs? What is the functionality of the weirs?
 - By coordinating weir inflation timing, we are able to recover sediment transport when necessary, like during large flow events.
- This sounds like a great project. I would love to see it. Have you ever considered holding field trips to the site?
 - Sure. We would have to coordinate with Camp Pendleton.

- How does water go from Fallbrook to Camp Pendleton?
 - They recharge then send up to Fallbrook. This is managed for water quality, water supply, and habitat for species.
- This watershed is not like a lot of places. Facilities are complicated. With a weir, they are taking water from wells not the lake. I sympathize with this project. Has additional wastewater development in Temecula/Murrieta affected the flows?
 - No, because the two systems are disconnected due to the lowered groundwater levels. Only during really, really large flows will you see any type of effect.
- How do you fold years of decision making into just hours to decide how to manage the bladder? How are you able to manage flows this quickly?
 - The system is mostly manual now, but it is intended to be automated in the new project.

2015 Urban Water Management Plan and 2016 Emergency Regulations

Ms. Alexi Schnell, San Diego County Water Authority, presented on the updates to the 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). The UWMP is required, by law, to be updated every five years and is a foundational document for other Water Authority long-range planning efforts. The plan is also an eligibility requirement for funding or drought assistance from the State. The 2015 UWMP includes normal and dry year regional demand projections and identifies projected water resource mixes for the San Diego region. It also assess supply reliability through scenario analyses.

One major update from the 2010 UWMP is the lower population growth rates and slower near-term economic growth due to the “Great Recession.” Two new regional sources, the Claude “Bud” Lewis Carlsbad Desalination Plant, producing 56,000 AF, and the San Vicente Carryover Storage, holding 100,000 AF of carryover, have also come on-line. Additionally, potable reuse has now become a significant local supply in the 2015 UWMP with 110,000 AF of water projected by 2040. Furthermore, it is projected that from 2020 to 2035, there will be a 15% increase in the proportion of SDCWA’s water supply mix that comes from potable reuse. The long-range forecast in the 2015 UWMP projects a 326,000 AF reduction in water demand from the 2010 UWMP projections. The 2015 UWMP was adopted by the State Water Resource Control Board (SWRCB) on June 23, 2016 and submitted to Department of Water Resources (DWR) on June 28, 2016.

The 2015 Urban Water Management Plan can be found at www.sdcwa.org/uwmp.

Questions/Comments:

- From 2020 to 2035, there is a 16,000 AF increase in the amount of water from desalination. Where’s this coming from?
 - The majority of the increase is from planned sources including from Camp Pendleton, the Otay/Rosarito Desalination project and about 5,000 AF will come from the Carlsbad facility.
- Will the diversification of San Diego’s water supply (i.e. reducing the amount of water we buy from Metropolitan Water District [MWD]) factor into MWD’s long-term planning efforts? In other words, because we will be reducing the quantity of water purchased, will we see an increase in MWD water prices in order for them to cover their fixed capital costs?
 - This is something we’ve been advocating for them to consider. It has been in discussion and the Water Authority provides information to MWD, so they are expecting it.

- There is talk that California is meeting with other Colorado River States to give up water rights to the Colorado River supplies and that we may be at risk of losing that supply source. So the diversification shown in the pie charts maybe reflects the reduced quantity from the Colorado River.
 - We wouldn't give up Colorado River rights, but may consider implementing conservation. MWD's Colorado River water is more at risk, which is why we are trying to reduce our reliance on MWD. What's actually more important are the Colorado transfers we have with the Imperial Irrigation District.

Mr. Jeff Stephenson, SDCWA, presented on the 2016 Emergency Regulations and Executive Order. The Governor's May 9, 2016 Executive Order (EO) has four areas of action: use water more wisely, eliminate water waste, strengthen local drought resilience, and improve agricultural water use efficiency and drought planning. The SWRCB amended the Emergency Regulation on May 18, 2016, which states that the individualized conservation standard will now be based on unique supply and demand conditions. The new regulation will be in effect from June 2016 to January 2017. Additionally, there is a compliance analysis option for wholesalers to certify on behalf of the entire region. This option is acceptable only if all retailers agree and commit to reporting monthly water use.

The EO includes a provision to develop new long-term water use efficiency (WUE) targets, which will build upon SBX7-7 (20% reduction by 2020). The provision aims to strengthen standards for water use across all sectors (outdoor irrigation, residential, commercial, etc) and water lost through leaks. Key issues with this provision include clearly defining the purpose of the new targets (i.e. what are we trying to achieve?) and differentiating them from emergency drought conservation. Another important concern is providing water agencies with localized options for setting targets, rather than setting a "one-size-fits-all" solution. The provision also recognizes the unintended consequences of increased conservation, such as reduced wastewater flows for water recycling, and reduced irrigation runoff into local watersheds. A schedule to develop the new long-term WUE targets was outlined. An Urban Advisory Group was formed in July 2016 and will develop a draft framework from August 2016 to January 2017. The framework will then be implemented in 2017. Mr. Stephenson also wanted to remind those in the meeting about the Water Authority's "Live WaterSmart" campaign as part of their continued water conservation efforts.

Questions/Comments:

- Why would we calculate water demand projections based on pre-mandatory conservation regulations?
 - The goal was to make a conservative estimate that pair these higher demands with increased conservation efforts.
- Was agricultural water used as part of the demand calculation?
 - No, the demands were strictly based on urban water use and if they use potable water. Agricultural use is a separate calculation.
- What about if agriculture takes directly from canals, etc?
 - This is not applicable to ag-users at this time.
- Is the Urban Advisory Group a state-wide group?
 - Yes, it is.

- New conservation targets are at 0%. What actions will the Water Authority take if we see an increase in water use?
 - The Water Authority will continue to promote water conservation programs. Many emergency drought aspects are permanent changes and we think everyone is on board with long-term conservation.

IRWM Grant Program

Mr. Mark Stadler, San Diego County Water Authority, presented on the DAC Planning Grant. There were a total of 22 projects submitted for consideration and the total grant request was \$13.3M. Targeted outreach to 16 DAC organizations and all 18 Native American tribes was conducted leading up to the DAC Planning Grant call for projects. Project selection was completed and RAC approval of projects are to take place after all recommended projects are presented. Mr. Travis Pritchard, San Diego Coastkeeper, Chair of DAC Project Selection Workgroup, explained the project selection process and highlighted the new DWR “pre-approval” step, in which DWR must review the funding proposal prior to submittal. A brief summary of the eight priority projects was presented with the total project cost, including grant administration, at \$4.709M. Three alternate projects were also identified in the event that DWR rejects the priority project package.

Questions/Comments:

- Until you see how a project gets scored, most are at a disadvantage of not understanding how it works. Next round, can we have a sample project example to walk through the project scoring process?
 - Good idea, yes.
- I didn’t see many water supply projects. Isn’t Proposition 1’s focus to supply economic assistance for projects that service DACs? What happened?
 - There are no specific water supply criteria for project selection. Part of the selection process was that we wanted to spread the dollars around to those we haven’t funded in the past. Additionally this is a planning grant so the actual implementation of the projects is still to be determined. Additional rounds of Proposition 1 funding are still to come and there will be more opportunities to fund water supply projects.

The RAC discussed and voted on the workgroup’s recommended project package for the DAC Planning Grant. There was a motion to approve grant request and it was seconded. Mr. Mark Stadler and Ms. Roselyn Prickett, RMC Water and Environment, were available to talk about the project selection process.

Vote: 24 yes.

Questions/Comments:

- I’m impressed by the number of flood control projects. What is the purpose of the Tier 2 projects?
 - This is a vetted list of projects that would be considered in the event that DWR rejects a priority project during their pre-approval process. We don’t think they will be rejected

because the selection process carefully considers the eligibility criteria. And we will try our hardest to appeal if DWR tries to reject any projects.

Mr. Mark Stadler presented a RWMG recommendation regarding letters of support. The recommendation states that the program manager can prepare and sign letters of support on behalf of the IRWM Program for any funded project in pursuing other funding sources. The RAC discussed this recommendation and agreed.

Questions/Comments:

- Keep in mind that we need to make sure that the project requesting a letter of support hasn't warped into something the RAC hasn't approved.
- Why are we only doing this for funded projects? Can we recommend/support projects that we haven't funded?
 - Funded projects have already been properly vetted during the project selection process and therefore have the RAC's approval. This is not the case for projects that we have not been funded. Maybe this can work on a case-by-case basis.
- Do Proposition 84 funded projects count as well?
 - Yes, any project that has been funded is eligible for a letter of support.

Ms. Stephanie Gaines, County of San Diego, discussed the Regional Stormwater Resource Plan (SWRP). The County was awarded \$374,350 in grant funding through the SWRCB's Storm Water Grant Program. Development of the SWRP will be kicking off this month and updates will be provided at RAC meetings throughout the process. A stakeholder outreach program will be implemented for the development of the SWRP and stakeholder workshops will be announced via IRWM email. .

IRWM Grant Administration

Ms. Loisa Burton presented a financial summary and progress report of all current and active projects that received Proposition 50 and Proposition 84 grants. All projects that received Proposition 50 funding are now complete and there are four projects that will be presenting at upcoming RAC meetings. Proposition 84, Rounds 1 and 2 are 98% and 80% complete, respectively.

Questions/Comments:

- Are there additional rounds of Proposition 1 funding coming through?
 - The DAC planning grant is this summer. Implementation rounds will come in the following summers (2017-19) with \$14-15M for each round.
- Lauma Willis, DWR: If you're not familiar with the SWP, I have brochures. The Bay Delta Conservation Plan is not the Water Fix and Eco Restore projects.

Summary and Next Steps

The Project Selection Workgroup will hold a debrief meeting to discuss the DAC Planning Grant process and how it could be improved. Next steps include Tri-County FACC coordination and meeting with DWR to approve the proposal.

Next RAC Meeting:

- October 5, 2016 – 9-11:30am

2016 Meeting Schedule:

- October 5, 2016
- December 7, 2016