



## **Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) Meeting #58 and Scoring Workshop**

August 5, 2015

9:00 am – 11:30 am

San Diego County Water Authority Board Room  
4677 Overland Avenue, San Diego, CA 92123

### **NOTES**

#### **Attendance**

---

##### **RAC Members**

Lan Wiborg, City of San Diego (chair)  
Ann Van Leer, Escondido Creek Conservancy  
Bill Hunter, Santa Fe Irrigation District  
Brian Olney, Helix Water District  
Chris Helmer, City of Imperial Beach  
Crystal Najera, City of Encinitas (and Alternate Ligeia Heagy)  
Emily Fudge for Gloria Silva, U.S. Forest Service  
Greg Thomas, Rincon del Diablo Municipal Water District  
Jack Simes, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation  
Jennifer Hazard, Alter Terra  
Jennifer Sabine, Sweetwater Authority  
John Flores, San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians  
Joni Johnson, Rural Community Assistance Corporation  
Joseph Randall for Kimberly Thorner, Olivenhain Municipal Water District  
Kimberly O'Connell, University of California – San Diego Clean Water  
Leigh Johnson, University of California Cooperative Extension (and Alternate Loretta Bates)  
Mark Seits, Floodplain Management Association  
Michael Bardin for Bill Hunter, Santa Fe Irrigation District  
Mike Thornton, San Elijo Joint Powers Authority  
Phil Pryde, San Diego River Park Foundation  
Ramin Abidi, County of San Diego (and Alternate Stephanie Gaines)  
Robyn Badger, Zoological Society of San Diego  
S. Wayne Rosenbaum for Michael McSweeney, Building Industry Association  
Steven Beppler for Bob Kennedy, Otay Water District  
Toby Roy, San Diego County Water Authority (and Alternate Mark Stadler)  
Travis Pritchard, San Diego CoastKeeper

##### **RWMG Staff and Consultants**

Alexis Brand, RMC Water and Environment  
Goldy Herbon, City of San Diego  
Loisa Burton, San Diego County Water Authority

Maria Mariscal, San Diego County Water Authority  
Mark Stephens, City of San Diego  
Roselyn Prickett, RMC Water and Environment  
Vicki Kalkirtz, City of San Diego

**Interested Parties to the RAC**

Anne Bamford, Industrial Environmental Association  
Antonia Estevet-Olea, LWA  
Carlos Michelin, San Diego County Water Authority  
Catherine Rom, City of San Diego  
Christina Agustin, City of Encinitas  
Deanna Spehn, Assembly Member Toni Atkins  
Dustin Harris, SDRC  
John Bolthouse, Water Conservation Garden  
Ryane Moss, San Diego River Park Foundation  
Rob Roy, La Jolla Band of Indians  
Sandra Jacobson, California Trout  
Sheri McPherson, County of San Diego  
Steven Beppler, Otay Water District  
Terrell Breaux, City of San Diego  
Travis Whitney, City of San Diego

**Welcome and Introductions**

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

**Southern California Flow Ecology Analysis**

Mr. Eric Stein, Southern California Coastal Water Research Project, presented the Southern California Flow Ecology Analysis to the group. The presentation gave an overview of the project and the goals of the watershed demonstration. The objective of the project is to develop an approach for establishing instream environmental flow requirements necessary to meet ecological benchmarks including: 1) How should streams in California be grouped or classified for the purposes of establishing environmental flow requirements? 2) What are the key hydrologic variables that should be used for environmental flow targets? 3) What are the key biological response variables that should be used when establishing environmental flow targets? and 4) What is the appropriate framework/approach for setting actual flow targets for specific stream types?

The ultimate goal of the project is to provide a convenient model system which can be applied to a “novel” site without requiring the time and money to develop custom models for each individual site. The pilot project will test the regional tool to see if the model works for a local area. And to test and validate metrics.

**Questions/Comments:**

- Does the model consider land use?
  - Considers pervious versus impervious surfaces only.

- Is the model calibrated to “novel” watershed?
  - Yes, combined criteria from 2-3 models and calibrated with perviousness data. The goal is a relatively quick process versus building a new model to determine stream flow data along ungagged reaches.
- How does it address watersheds with reservoirs (dams)?
  - The model does consider reservoir storage, but only gross levels. The model does not include stormwater-groundwater interaction.
- What if this winter is an El Nino? Data would not be reliable.
  - No new data would be collected to validate model metrics. Would only use existing and historical data to determine validity, which would be based on knowledge of the watershed by stakeholders. The model uses data from 1990 to 2013 to capture variability between years.
- How is this related to stormwater discussions of reducing flows to reduce non-point source pollution?
  - Trying to better understand effects of low impact development (LID) on biological integrity. Want to offer data for informed decisions.
- Biological organisms have differing tolerance to flow.
  - The project focuses on using benthic invertebrates as indicator species. More finely tuned criteria, such as temperature sensitivity are “trait statistics”.
- Is there any partnership with San Diego State University (SDSU) Watershed Science Institute?
  - We are beginning to collaborate. This meeting is one way to collaborate. As a next step, interested parties should contact Eric Stein ([erics@sccwrp.org](mailto:erics@sccwrp.org)).

### **Watershed Management in Cleveland National Forest**

---

Ms. Emily Fudge, U.S. Forest Service – Cleveland National Forest, presented on Watershed Management in the Cleveland National Forest (CNF). Discussed in this presentation were land management objectives, issues and direction, IRWM projects in the CNF, and other CNF projects. The land management objectives are to find a balance between different resources and to provide opportunities for use while protecting natural resources. The CNF is unique compared to other National Forests in that it is not a continuous park, there are numerous inholdings, the park is located adjacent to high population densities, no timber activities take place on the CNF, the close proximity to high density populations results in high recreational and special uses, and the headwaters to many municipal water systems are located on the CNF. The CNF is also susceptible to fires due to the proximity to high density populations, fire adapted vegetation, Santa Ana winds, and warm temperatures. The Land Management Plan (LMP) directs fuel efforts to focus on wildland-urban interface (WUI) treatments and fuel reduction. Land management issues that affect water quality and supply include invasive weeds such as arundo and tamarisk, and soils vulnerable to erosion.

A Watershed Condition Assessment identified Cedar Creek and Kitchen Creek-Cottonwood Creek as priority watersheds, and Watershed Restoration Action Plans (WRAP) were developed. The Cedar Creek Priority Watershed WRAP led to one of the CNF’s IRWM projects, which includes invasive weed treatment, trail and road decommissioning and the removal of feral pigs.

Questions/Comments:

- Does the Forest Land Management Plan include the San Luis Rey watershed?
  - The San Luis Rey watershed is included in the ranking. The Land Management Plan includes objectives for the watershed.
- The MS4 permit's hydrologic modification requires coarse sediment supply to rivers. Does the CNF participate in the MS4 permit?
  - CNF is trying to restore natural sediment processes. We are working on a project to remove dams at Trabuco Canyon, which retain sediment.
- How is CNF "managing" feral pigs?
  - USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) traps pigs, then dispatches them.
- Have you considered a partnership with Oceanside on a grant for basin management?

**IRWM Grant Program**

---

Ms. Loisa Burton presented an update on Proposition 50 and 84 Grants. Proposition 50 Grant terminates in June 2016 and the projects are progressing as planned. An update on Proposition 84, Round 1 Grants was given. These projects are continuing as planned and are set to end in May 2017. Most of the Proposition 84, Round 2 Grant projects have commenced work. The Proposition 84, Drought Round is still waiting for the final grant agreements.

**Project Completion Report: Carlsbad Desalination Project Local Conveyance**

Mr. Jeremy Crutchfield, SDCWA, presented on the Carlsbad Desalination Project Local Conveyance, Project Completion Report. SDCWA's goal is to increase San Diego Region's water supply reliability through supply diversification. The Carlsbad Desalination Local Conveyance Project will improve regional water supply reliability by increasing local water supplies by 7%. The project included 10 miles of new 54-inch steel pipe to connect the Carlsbad Desalination Plant to the Pipeline Interconnection in San Marcos, 5 miles of Pipeline 3 (aqueduct) relining, and Twin Oaks Valley Water Treatment Plant improvements. The Carlsbad Desalination Plant will produce 50 MGD of seawater desalination, making it one of the largest desalination plants in the Western Hemisphere. Remaining tasks for the project include Phase II Commissioning (, to be complete in September 2015, Site Visit, to be complete on October 6th or 7<sup>th</sup>, and the Final Report, to be complete December 2015.

Questions/Comments:

- How much lift from plant to plant?
  - 1,100 ft. PS @ Desalination Plant (8 pumps)
- What will the water quality of blended supply be? Will there be any adverse effects?
  - Lots of modeling has been done and no adverse effects are anticipated. Chemical additions prior to blending will make the water quality similar to current water quality.

## **Proposition 84, Final Round and Proposition 1**

---

Ms. Goldy Herbon, City of San Diego, presented on the Final Round of Proposition 84 funding and Mr. Mark Stadler, SDCWA, presented on Proposition 1. The Proposition 84 Final Round Grant is wrapping up. The RWMG and consultant team are performing final QA/QC and the Proposal will be submitted to DWR on August 7th. Under Proposition 1, DWR has included a second definition for disadvantaged communities (DAC) – economically distressed areas (EDA). The definition change is as follows: “Economically distressed area (EDA) is a municipality with <20,000 population with an annual median household income (MHI) <85% Statewide MHI and with one or more of the following conditions: 1) Financial hardship; 2) Unemployment rate >2% higher than Statewide average; and 3) Low population density. Under Proposition 1, DWR anticipates \$35 million for planning efforts that directly address EDA/DAC needs in 2016, \$35 million for construction of projects that directly address EDA/DAC needs in 2017, and the first round of typical IRWM Grant solicitation in 2018.

### Questions/Comments:

- What is a “municipality”?
  - A municipality as a definable geography. If it is in an urban area, you need to defend it as separate from the larger area.
- For the “financial hardship” definition, there is a need to consider cost of living differences within the State.
- Is the \$70 million for DAC/EDA a separate pot of funding, or part of the \$510 million total available from this chapter of Proposition 1.
  - Any EDA that is awarded to the San Diego Region comes from the Region’s \$38 million pot.

## **Summary and Next Steps**

---

### Next RAC Meeting:

- October 7, 2015 – 9-11:30am

### 2015 Meeting Schedule:

- December 2, 2015