



Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) Meeting #56 and Scoring Workshop

May 6, 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

Toby Roy, San Diego County Water Authority (chair)
Albert Lau, Padre Dam (and Alternate Arne Sandvik)
Ann Van Leer, Escondido Creek Conservancy
Bill Hunter, Santa Fe Irrigation District
Brian Olney, Helix Water District
Brinton Swift for Mark Seits, Floodplain Management Association
Chris Helmer, City of Imperial Beach
Crystal Najera, City of Encinitas
Gloria Silva, U.S. Forest Service (and Alternate Emily Fudge)
Jennifer Hazard, Alter Terra
Jennifer Sabine, Sweetwater Authority
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, San Diego Zoological Society
Kimberly O'Connell, University of California – San Diego Clean Water
Leigh Johnson, University of California Cooperative Extension (and Alternate Loretta Bates)
Ligeia Heagy for Crystal Najera, City of Encinitas
Michael McSweeney, Building Industry Association
Mike Thornton, San Elijo Joint Powers Authority
Patrick Crais, California Landscape Contractors
Stephanie Gaines for Ramin Abidi, County of San Diego
Travis Pritchard, San Diego CoastKeeper

RWMG Staff and Consultants

Amber Rogers, County of San Diego
Jeffry Pasek, City of San Diego
Loisa Burton, San Diego County Water Authority
Mark Stadler, San Diego County Water Authority
Mark Stephens, City of San Diego
Vicki Kalkirtz, City of San Diego

Crystal Benham, RMC Water and Environment
Dawn Flores, RMC Water and Environment
Rosalyn Prickett, RMC Water and Environment
Sally Johnson, RMC Water and Environment

Interested Parties to the RAC

Amy Czajkowski, City of Oceanside
Anne Bamford, Industrial Environmental Association
Arwa Sayed, City of San Diego
Brian Smith, Phoenix Energy
Carlos Michelin, San Diego County Water Authority
Diane Elias, Michael Baker Intl.
Dianne Modelo, City of San Diego
Janice DuVall, San Diego County Office of Education
Jason Dafforn, City of Oceanside
Jim Rasmus, Black and Veatch/City of Escondido
Joel Kramer, public
John Bolthouse, Water Conservation Garden
Kyrsten Burr-Rosenthal, City of San Diego
Lorraine Frigolet, Water Conservation Garden
Megan Baehrens, San Diego Coastkeeper
Michele Shumate, San Diego County Water Authority
Terrell Breaux, City of San Diego
Virginia Lorne, The Trust for Public Land
Wilson Kennedy, City of San Diego

Welcome and Introductions

Ms. Toby Roy, San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA), welcomed everyone to the meeting. Ms. Roy announced that Mr. Bob Yamada would be serving as the new Water Resources Director of SDCWA. Introductions were made around the room.

Final Proposition 84 Grant Solicitation: Project Scoring Process

Ms. Roy explained the purpose of today's workshop was to discuss the project scoring process, project scores, solicit input from the public and the Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) on project scores, and to conduct breakout groups to discuss project priorities.

Ms. Crystal Benham, RMC Water and Environment, provided an overview of the project selection and review process. Projects were submitted to the online Project Database by the closing date of April 22, 2015. Following closure of the database, all projects were scored and ranked using the scoring criteria approved by the RAC at the April 1, 2015 meeting. Project scoring was completed by a third party with an internal firewall established by the RWMG. Scores would be discussed today, and the Project Selection Workgroup would evaluate projects in greater detail. Ms. Benham reminded the group that the Project Selection Workgroup had already been provided materials for each of the projects submitted to the database, and they had more information than would be presented at today's workshop. Projects invited to interview with the Project Selection Workgroup should expect interviews to be held May 14 and May 15, 2015. A final suite of projects would be presented to the

RAC for approval at the June 3, 2015 meeting. Project sponsors were provided the opportunity to submit written comments when the scores were released, and those comments would be provided to the Project Selection Workgroup. Ms. Benham reminded the group that projects would not be rescored, but any comments received in writing prior to the workshop or at the workshop, would be considered by the Workgroup. Scores are intended to form the starting point for Workgroup discussions and considerations.

Ms. Dawn Flores, RMC Water and Environment, presented the scoring and ranking process used for projects submitted to the Project Database. All projects were required to meet Objective A (integrated solutions), Objective B (stakeholder involvement), and one other objective of the 2013 IRWM Plan, as well as provide two quantifiable physical benefits to be considered eligible. Eligible projects were then scored in accordance with the RAC-approved scoring criteria. Ms. Flores presented an overview of how scoring criteria were applied, and reminded the group of the weighting assigned to each criteria. Projects were able to receive partial credit for indirectly addressing some of the benefits, as described by Ms. Flores.

Numeric Scoring Results

Ms. Benham informed that group that during the Call for Projects (March 18-April 22), a total of 31 projects were submitted to the database, for a total grant request of \$102.5 million. Scores were released April 28. Following scoring and comments received from project sponsors, a total of 29 projects were being considered (two projects were deemed ineligible or dropped out). At the April 1, 2015 meeting, the RAC recommended the workgroup fund 15-20 projects for a total grant request of \$30.2 million, with a minimum grant request of \$500,000.

Ms. Benham presented three scoring tables, where projects were ranked by total score, ranked within their primary water management strategy, and sorted and ranked by location. The highest scoring project received a weighted score of 3.9 points. Ms. Benham then reviewed some observations made regarding the numerical scores. She noted that grouping the projects into Tier 1 (top 50% of scores) and Tier 2 (bottom 50% of scores) puts 15 projects in Tier 1, the minimum number of projects the Workgroup was asked to include in the final suit of projects. As a result, some projects within Tier 2 would need to be considered by the Workgroup. Ms. Benham explained that there was a distinct gap in scores where higher scoring projects all created new water, and lower scoring projects did not create new water. This difference is attributed to the weighting of the scoring criteria, wherein creating new water contributed to 25% of the overall score. However, projects that scored lower tended to also provide more types of benefits, such as watershed services. There was found to be no correlation between the grant request and project score.

Ms. Benham invited the RAC and the public to provide comments on the scores, which were recorded for consideration by the Project Selection Workgroup. In addition to the project-specific comments provided, the group discussed whether the Workgroup should provide equal consideration to all 29 projects, rather than greater consideration for Tier 1 projects and elevation of individual projects from Tier 2 into Tier 1. It was decided that equal consideration for all projects created too heavy a burden on the Workgroup and could undermine the project selection process established in the 2013 IRWM Plan.

Caucus Priority Breakout Groups

The group was asked to convene breakout groups by RAC caucus (Water Supply, Water Quality, Natural Resources and Watersheds, Disadvantaged Communities/Environmental Justice [DAC/EJ], and Other) to discuss projects. Each group was asked to consider the projects' ability to address issues relevant to their caucus, as well as the projects' competitiveness for funding. The goal of the breakout groups was to find consensus on the caucus' priorities to recommend to the Project Selection Workgroup. Following the breakout groups, these recommendations were presented to the group as a whole:

Water Supply: Workgroup should not exclusively include water supply/conservation projects. Should consider readiness to processed and timely results. Consideration should be given to how projects quantify their benefits, cost-effectiveness, and for water supply projects whether they offset existing demand. Recommend elevating the Sweetwater Wetlands project and the Hodges Reservoir project.

Water Quality: Water quality should have equal or more weight than water supply when considered by the Workgroup. Workgroup should consider projects that provide multiple benefits. Water quality projects usually include multiple benefits. The percentage of total funding match should not be considered as a factor in selecting projects, and projects should be distributed across the region. Recommend including at least three water quality projects. This caucus did not feel they had enough information on the projects to recommend elevation of any projects into Tier 1.

Natural Resources and Watersheds: There is potential for water supply protection projects to complement natural resource projects, and this should be considered by the Workgroup. Would like to see projects that provide diverse benefits and be distributed geographically. The Workgroup should remember that natural resource projects may have an urgency that is not inherent to other types of projects (e.g. land available for restoration now may not be available in the future).

DAC/EJ: Considered whether projects reduced water threats to DACs and if it elevates water benefits DACs. Recommend the Workgroup look at the 2013 IRWM Plan for DAC needs and issues, and focus on community outreach and involvement. Also recommends prioritizing DAC projects that provide greatest direct spending on DACs. The workgroup should elevate Project 1731 Ms. SmartyPlants to Tier 1. As a final note, the caucus found the map showing project locations in relation to DACs to be inaccurate.

Other: Recommend putting together a comprehensive package of projects where each project provided multiple benefits, but the package of projects provided a wide range of benefits. In addition, the Workgroup should consider both how quickly benefits would start being realized, as well as the magnitude of the benefit. Would like to see more than just water supply projects.

Summary and Next Steps

The RAC was reminded that the next step in the grant process was to convene the Project Selection Workgroup, and that selected project sponsors would receive a data request in early June.

Next RAC Meeting:

- June 3, 2015 – 9-11:30am (Final project suite presented to RAC for approval)

2015 Meeting Schedule:

- August 5, 2015
- October 7, 2015
- December 2, 2015