



**Regional Advisory Committee
Meeting #26 Notes**

April 7, 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
Barry Lindgren, San Elijo Lagoon Conservancy
Bill Hunter, Santa Fe Irrigation District
Casey Anderson, Farm Bureau San Diego County
Cathy Pieroni, City of San Diego
Charlotte Pienkos, The Nature Conservancy
Craig Adams, San Dieguito River Valley Conservancy
Dave Harvey, Rural Communities Assistance Corporation
Iovanka Todt, Floodplain Management Association
Jennifer Kovecses, San Diego CoastKeeper
Jeremy Jungreis, United States Marine Corps
Jim Smyth, Sweetwater Authority
Kirk Ammerman, City of Chula Vista
Linda Flournoy, Planning and Engineering for Sustainability
Linden Burzell, Yuima Municipal Water District
Lisa Gover, Campo Kumeyaay Nation
Lori Vereker, City of Escondido
Mark Weston, Helix Water District
Megan Cooper, California Coastal Conservancy
Mike Thornton, San Elijo Joint Powers Authority
Neal Brown, Padre Dam Municipal Water District
Rob Hutsel, San Diego River Park Foundation
Toby Roy, San Diego County Water Authority

Non-Voting Members

Greg Krzys, United States Bureau of Reclamation
Marilyn Thoms, Tri-County FACC – South Orange County IRWM
Perry Louck, Tri-County FACC – Upper Santa Margarita IRWM

RWVG Staff

Jeffery Pasek, City of San Diego
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
Cid Tesoro, County of San Diego
Daniel Cozad, IPM
Drew Kleis, City of San Diego
Eduardo Pech, California Department of Water Resources
Heather Parkison, RMC Water and Environment
Jane Davies, Sweetwater Authority
Jeff Ortmeier, California Rural Water Association
Joey Randall, Olivenhain Municipal Water District
Kelley Gage, San Diego County Water Authority
Kelly Craig, Zoological Society of San Diego
Lisa Skutecki, Industrial Environmental Association
Mark Umphres, Helix Water District
Nancy Bragado, City of San Diego
Natalie De Freitas, City of San Diego
Robert Pierce, San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board
Robyn Badger, Zoological Society of San Diego
Rosalyn Stewart, RMC Water and Environment
Tish Berge, RMC Water and Environment
Jennifer Wong, California Department of Water Resources
Peter Fojec, unknown
Crystal Najera, City of Chula Vista

Introductions

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

San Diego IRWM Updates

DWR Update

Anna Aljabiry, California Department of Water Resources (DWR), explained that submittal dates and deadlines for the upcoming grant cycle(s) have not yet been determined. DWR has received multiple requests to clarify dates in the draft PSPs. DWR is expecting to issue the \$7.4 million Mini-50 PSP in late May [*editorial note: San Diego IRWM region is not eligible for the Mini-50 since we received a full \$25 million under Proposition 50*]. The Planning, Implementation, and Stormwater Flood Management PSPs are anticipated for release sometime in late June/early July. The Local Groundwater Assistance (LGA) PSP will be delayed until August.

DWR has set a monthly duty officer schedule to answer questions phoned into the IRWM hotline. Ms. Aljabiry will serve as the duty officer for the month of April 2010.

DWR has decided to contract with a consultant to provide technical assistance for IRWM regions during planning and grant applications. This contract will be for \$4 million over three years. Only two consultants applied for the project, likely due to conflicts of interest. DWR will choose a consultant in six weeks in order to announce the choice to the public and have the consultant in place for technical assistance during grant application submittal.

Currently, a facilitation contract is in place through California State University, Sacramento, which helps IRWM regions with outreach. Facilitation support may be requested through DWR, and the Center for Collaborative Policy will respond.

Proposition 50 Update

Ms. Rosalyn Stewart, RMC Water and Environment, introduced Ms. Loisa Burton, the new Grants Administrator for the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA). Ms. Burton explained that she will assist Mr. Mark Stadler with invoicing and monitoring project schedules and budgets, as well as serve as the primary lead for interactions with DWR. Currently, SDCWA is waiting for five or six contracts to be executed. On Thursday April 1, 2010, SDCWA held a Local Project Sponsor workshop to review reporting and invoicing expectations, including the labor compliance section. In regards to grant budget status, \$840,000 in invoices has been submitted to DWR and SDCWA is expecting a response from DWR this month. The second round of invoicing will be due on April 15, 2010.

Breakout Sessions on Collaboration with Regional Board

Ms. Rosalyn Stewart thanked the RAC and interested parties for their participation in last meeting's breakout sessions. Ms. Stewart shared the session's outcomes that the IRWM program and the Regional Board can collaborate on the following topics of mutual interest: basin planning, IRWM participation, monitoring and assessment, indirect potable reuse, recycled water, mitigation/MSCP coordination, joint stakeholder outreach, land use planning, interface between water supply and water quality, and landscapes and LID. The IRWM's role in the implementation of the Regional Board's priorities was thought to include: providing input to the Regional Board, leveraging joint stakeholder outreach, integrating the Regional Board's goals into the IRWMP's goals, and providing tools for the Regional Board to prepare permits. Ms. Stewart explained that these ideas will be incorporated in the Agency Collaboration chapter of the IRWM Plan Update.

Project Database

Ms. Stewart explained that the online project database is nearing completion (public release is scheduled for May 19, 2010) and asked for volunteers to spend a week exploring the database's beta version. These volunteers would then attend a workshop to provide input on the database. The following individuals volunteered:

- Linda Flournoy, Planning and Engineering for Sustainability
- Anna Aljabiry, California Department of Water Resources
- Lori Vereker, City of Escondido
- Dave Harvey, Rural Communities Assistance Corporation
- Anne Bamford, Industrial Environmental Association
- Mark Umphres, Helix Water District
- Robyn Badger, Zoological Society of San Diego
- Lisa Gover, Campo Kumeyaay Nation
- Joey Randall, Olivenhain Municipal Water District
- Kim Vance, City of San Diego (via Cathy Pieroni)

The public release of the database will be announced widely and will be followed with a series of "Call for Projects" workshops which will instruct users and explain what project information should be entered in the database. On that note, Ms. Stewart announced that project prioritization criteria will be a key segment of the next RAC meeting in June.

- Mr. Keith Greer, SANDAG, asked how long the Call for Projects will last.
 - The Call for Projects will be open for at least one month. RWMG staff will remain in close contact with DWR in order to ensure as much time as possible.
 - Local project sponsors should contact their watershed representatives about their projects, since watershed representatives will weigh in on project prioritization.

Proposition 84 Update

Ms. Stewart explained that DWR's current schedule regarding Proposition 84 had not changed from the last RAC meeting. The Draft Guidelines/PSPs were released in early March 2010, and is currently in a 30-day public review period. After the review period, there will be 45-60 days for DWR revisions, followed by release of the Final Guidelines/PSPs in late June 2010. Upon this release, there will be a 45-60 day application period, which is due in late August 2010. Based on DWR's current schedule, the Call for Projects will begin on May 19, 2010, and additional RAC meetings will be scheduled as needed. The RWMG will work with DWR to make sure that the project selection process is not unnecessarily rushed.

Draft IRWM Guidelines

Ms. Stewart listed the four sets of draft guidelines issued by DWR on March 8, 2010: IRWM Guidelines, Planning Grant PSP, Implementation Grant PSP, and Stormwater Flood Management PSP. She then explained the contents of the guidelines, and discussed what comments the RWMG has thus far. In light of current economic conditions and changes in water management since 2007 (with drought and Delta limitations), the RWMG will request that planning grants are released in advance of implementation grants. The RWMG will also request that potable reuse be specifically included as an eligible Water Conservation and Reuse project. A draft letter will be circulated to the RAC on Thursday, April 8, 2010 and there will be a five-day review process. The draft IRWM Guidelines outline program terms and eligibility criteria and presents sixteen chapters, five of which are new.

Comments and Questions

- Water quality and wetlands were not key issues to highlight for Proposition 50 grant application. Proposition 84 guidelines were supposed to include coastal protections and wetlands. Does it look like that is occurring?
 - Water quality, wetlands, and coastal protections are all resource management strategies included in the draft Guidelines. Proposition 84 will support multi-benefit projects which include wetlands and flood protection.
- Does the flood management resource management strategy include soft-path or natural flood plain management?
 - Yes.
- What funding is available through Proposition 84 vs 1E?
 - Planning Grant -- \$20 million statewide, \$1 million per region
 - Implementation Grant -- \$91 million for San Diego Funding Area, \$71 million for San Diego region per MOU, \$7.9 million in Round 1
 - Stormwater Flood Management – Up to \$30 million per project
- Request that DWR provide a streamlined process for non-competitive Funding Areas such as our (with our Tri-County MOU).

- DWR thinks the San Diego Funding Area has the ideal setup. DWR has advised other regions and funding areas to review our MOU, which details how Proposition 84 funding will be allocated, with hopes that other regions/funding areas will follow suit.
- Can this Tri-County MOU be considered in the grant application process to reduce submittal requirements?
 - The MOU does not bind the State, but DWR supports our effort and wants regions to collaborate like this.
- Suggestion for the region to emphasize smaller projects in the next grant cycle.
 - There are no criteria for size of project. DWR's preference is for any-size multi-benefit projects. A table of program preferences will be distributed to the group.

Draft Planning Grant PSP

Ms. Stewart explained that the Planning Grant would cover the IRWM Plan update, as well as new or focused planning such as regional flood management or salt/nutrient management planning (which would be incorporated into the IRWM Plan as attachments). The proposed match is 50%, so we have to match what we ask for. For example, if we put in \$1 million, we have to match with \$1 million in local funds.

Comments and Questions

- Support expressed for development of floodplain management plans under the Planning Grant application.
- If we ask planning grant funding before implementation funding, we may need to make sure we are ready with extra RAC meetings.
 - Yes, we will need to vet the Planning Grant Work Plan with the RAC prior to submittal of the application.
- Regarding salt/nutrient management planning, do the guidelines allow for sub-basin planning – can we use it for small basins since we don't have any major basins?
 - The guidelines are applicable to San Diego's small groundwater basin situation.
- What about watershed planning? Will DWR support watershed management planning?
 - Watershed planning is one of the multi-benefits that DWR hopes to see realized, but the bond language requires that the emphasis is on water supply, water quality, and reliability.
- Who is the applicant for the planning grant?
 - The San Diego IRWM region will decide. Generally the RWMG selects one of their governing agencies.
 - DWR prefers that the agency that submitted the RAP application, in San Diego's case SDCWA would be the applicant. Any changes in applying agency would need to be made in writing with DWR.
- What about the link to the AB 32 objectives and addressing climate change? Is it important to demonstrate emission reductions?
 - The IRWM Plan Standards require a new chapter on climate change.

- Yes, emissions reductions will be incorporated into the Implementation Grant Round 2. Unfortunately, the draft PSPs were already written by the time the AS 32 guidance was published (Jan 2010).

Draft Implementation Grant PSP

Ms. Stewart explained that the Draft Implementation Grant PSP outlines eligibility criteria, including consistency with the IRWM Plan. She further detailed that there is a \$10.1 million allocation for San Diego Funding Area, which means \$7.9 million for the San Diego region per the Tri-County MOU.

The RWMG will request make several requests to DWR:

- The RWMG will request that DWR allow a streamlined application process for non-competitive regions. Since we are by design a non-competitive region and committed to collaboration with the Tri-County regions, we request that DWR not require submittal of all 13 attachments. For example, two extensive economic analysis attachments might be waived for funding areas with adopted agreements.
- The RWMG will request that DWR allow a larger consolidated grant award to the region, concurrent with our past award of \$25 million.
 - DWR will not likely acquiesce to this request since all regions throughout the State do not qualify for Round 1 and more than 1/9th the total bond amount cannot be released [*editorial note: only 1/9th was appropriated through SBx2-1*]. Perhaps in Round 2 this might be more appropriate.
- The RWMG will request that implementation grant reimbursement applies to costs after March 8, 2010 (release of draft PSP), in order to avoid stalling the implementation projects while waiting for contract execution.
 - Cost shares (funding match) can be backed up to September 30, 2008. However, it's important to have a firm date for reimbursable costs too.
 - Consider proposing the date coinciding with release of final PSP or the date the SBx2-1 legislation was passed.
 - Will the RWMG propose this for the planning grant as well?
 - Yes, since firm dates were given with Proposition 50, there is precedent.
 - We are requesting this change because there appears to be a bias in favor of larger and wealthier agencies which can afford to fund or float projects in the interim between grant award and execution. Smaller agencies and non-profits will be unfairly burdened by having to stall their projects.
 - Concern about scope and budget changes that may occur between the grant application submittal and the contract execution.
 - DWR is open to minor project amendments before execution and during the contract terms, but no essential changes can be made.

Comments and Questions

- Are tribal communities eligible for implementation grant funds?
 - Yes, the draft guidelines specify that tribal communities can be project sponsors.
 - Now that we have the draft guidelines, the RWMG is kicking off targeted DAC and tribal outreach to identify good integrated projects.

- The draft comment letter is also going to the RAC for review, and the tribal representative should certainly weigh in.
- Project sponsors should not assume they will be approved and spend money expecting reimbursement. It is important that people wait until their project is selected for the grant application and we have been notified by DWR of a grant award.
- The San Diego region is being penalized because other IRWM regions cannot get it together! We have typically been a donor region, meaning that we send out more than we get back. In Proposition 50, we had to push our legislators to get more cash. The \$10.1 million allocation under Proposition 84 will not let us do much. Suggest the allocation be increased in Round 1 for regions that are ready to proceed with implementation projects.
 - DWR understands our situation, but they must make decisions in the best interests of all IRWM regions in the State, many of which are not ready for a larger grant award. There are 46 groups in 11 different funding areas. DWR thought for 8 months to find something that works for the State as a whole.
- Request a tentative funding schedule for Rounds 2 and 3 so that we may plan ahead.
 - DWR will consider issuing a funding schedule, but at this point only \$100 million has been appropriated.
- The RAC should not to think small. Suggest doing our project review/selection process with an eye on the entire Proposition 84 amount. Using a phased approach will allow us to see the bigger picture.
- Suggestion to include a task for project ranking/selection updates in the Planning Grant application. (Knocks of agreement)
 - Round 2 is anticipated to be larger and regions will have planning in place.
- The RWMG will request that DWR extend the Implementation Grant timeline to 12 or 16 weeks, since getting all the information for the projects in 6 weeks would be difficult.
- The RWMG will request that DWR simplify the cost/benefit analysis, since substantial administrative costs are involved when DWR is supposed to be deferring to region's project list.

Draft Stormwater Flood Management PSP

Ms. Rosalyn Stewart explained that the Draft Stormwater Flood Management PSP outlines eligibility criteria, including consistency with the IRWM Plan. Projects must be designed to manage stormwater runoff to reduce flooding, and address public health and seismic safety concerns. This PSP presents the maximum grant award of \$30 million per project with a 50% match, and provides application instructions.

- Has DWR received requests for a funding match requirement that is less than 50%?
 - The requirements are 50% match for planning grants, 25% match for implementation grants, and 50% for stormwater flood management grants.

A letter will be distributed for RAC review on Thursday April 8, 2010. Comments will be due to RMC on April 13, 2010. The final comment letter will go to everyone on the RAC and interested parties, and will be posted on the IRWM website. The RAC may use the language in the draft comment letter to create their own letters to DWR, if so desired.

Panel: Exploring the Relationship Between Water Resources and Land Use Planning

Ms. Tish Berge, RMC Water and Environment, welcomed the panel members and thanked them for joining the panel. She introduced the purpose of the panel, which was to understand the existing relationships between water managers and land use planners, identify shortcomings in the current system, and brainstorm opportunities for improved communication and collaboration. Ms. Berge introduced each panelist and provided a short biography.

Introduction – Mr. Jeff Murphy, County of San Diego, gave an introduction and overview of the layers of local land use planning. Mr. Murphy explained that the General Plan is the blueprint for what gets built in San Diego, and sets the tone for local development policy, with seven elements ranging from land use, to safety, to conservation. Mr. Murphy explained how the seven elements of the General Plan intertwine with land use, road network and community plans, implementation plans and zoning, regulatory and municipal codes. Mr. Murphy further explained the Discretionary Permit Review process for a subdivision which includes players such as the general plan, water districts, sewer districts, fire and police departments, state and federal regulations, zoning ordinances and regulatory codes, and CEQA requirements.

Developers must also consider water availability in terms of SB 901, SB 610, and SB 221 which require a developer to provide a formal and detailed analysis on long term water availability for any new development. Finally, there are water quality restrictions such as municipal stormwater permits and local stormwater regulations, on top of CEQA guidelines. Consistency is important and since most jurisdictions are currently updating their general plans, now would be a good time to establish that consistency. Early and frequent communication with water agencies, and consistency and assurances in review and assessment processes are vital.

Case Study #1 – Ms. Kelley Gage, San Diego County Water Authority, discussed the importance of water in regional planning. Coordination between land use agencies and water suppliers is critical to ensure water supply can keep up with growth, protect and maximize local resources, and aid in water efficiency. Ms. Gage detailed the involvement of agencies in the coordination of General Plans, SANDAG's Regional Growth Forecast, projected water demands, Urban Water Management Plans, the Water Supply Element of SANDAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan, SB 610, SB 221, and City and County plans and policies. The tactical approach to implementing the results of this coordination is to adopt ordinances and standards such as LEED certification and landscape ordinances.

Case Study #2 – Mr. Drew Kleis and Ms. Nancy Bragado, City of San Diego, explained the critical relationship between water quality and land use planning. Designing pollutants out of a community is more effective than treating the storm water. Mr. Kleis commented that water quality should continue to be addressed through land use planning, but that communication and participation should be increased and improved to reduce tension between land use and resource planning. Mr. Kleis suggested establishing regular mechanisms for providing information to planning departments, providing watershed-specific information, and using watershed specific information for CEQA significance criteria. Finally, he discussed the need for issues which transcend jurisdictional boundaries to occur before the land use planning process begins. A venue, such as the IRWM program, for consensus building among agencies and entities would be helpful.

Ms. Nancy Bragado discussed the 2008 City of San Diego General Plan, and its shift from greenfield development to reinvestment in existing communities, while maintaining a focus on sustainability through smart growth policies—which includes the key consideration of water

issues. The General Plan addresses water from conservation and management perspective, as well as from an infrastructure perspective, stressing coordinated planning and public education in addition to the implementation of conservation tactics. The implementation measures are identified in the General Plan's Action Plan, which includes many water related implementation measures. Ms. Bragado discussed regional collaboration with the Regional Comprehensive Plan, growth forecasts, and the UWMP, but noted that this does not allow for flexibility to support smart growth projects at a given location. For this reason, a water supply contingency for land use plan updates and amendments is being considered. On a smaller scale, the City is internally collaborating on sustainability issues such as climate protection, land use, water, stormwater, and more. All in all, Ms. Bragado stressed that collaboration is necessary to tackle impending water issues and infrastructure.

Case Study #3 – Mr. Cid Tosoro, San Diego Flood Control District, discussed flood control issues in the region. The San Diego Flood Control District covers the unincorporated areas of the county, and each city has its own flood control responsibilities. The District's primary mission is to protect people, property, and facilities from flood and storm damage, but it can also provide watershed and water quality management. Flood control facilities have a direct relationship with land use since the amount of runoff generated is dependent on the physical makeup of the watersheds in that area. The District is working on coordination efforts with water, wastewater, stormwater, and environmental agencies on master planning. Focusing on flood protection, the District is preparing 11 Master Drainage Reports, one for each watershed, to determine the need for facilities and to prepare for the inclusion in master plans. The District is also working with the County Planning Department to include awareness of key flood control issues in development approvals. In addition to flood control, facilities can provide water quality benefits. The District's involvement in the Board of Supervisors is limited. Mr. Tosoro listed several multiple benefits that can be provided by flood control facilities including water quality improvement, groundwater recharge, and reducing sediment loads, and suggested that land use planners take these into consideration. He suggested early and consistent communication among the District, water agencies, and land use planners in the planning process.

Case Study #4 – Mr. Neal Brown, Padre Dam Municipal Water District, discussed the opportunities for a productive relationship between land use planners and water managers. Mr. Brown explained that relationships among many players with different sets of rules and constituencies can influence management decisions for utilities and agencies. In the past, water planning has had limited influence. But with the current long term supply challenges and General Plan updates, the landscape ordinance, and a drought management team, the need for influence and coordination has grown. Using Padre Dam's efforts as a starting point, Mr. Brown demonstrated positive practices such as coordination of monthly meetings among utilities, quarterly engineering coordination, project specific coordination with developments and Caltrans, staff support at council or board meeting, and coordination with fire departments and school districts have all helped to achieve goals with various players. Mr. Brown reiterated that there are many instances in which land use and water planning overlap and these are opportunities for coordination and the fostering of productive relationships to ensure consistency and smooth development.

Group Discussion

Ms. Berge began the group discussion with a few questions to the panelists about opportunities for improved communication and collaboration. She then opened the floor for RAC and public comments, suggestions, and questions.

Summary of Panel Suggestions

- Maintain an open dialogue between water agencies and land use authorities during the discretionary review process, as projects often change during development review.
- Develop a consistent communication and review process for your land use authority, to be used with applicable water, wastewater, and flood agencies.
- Share water (SB 610) and stormwater (MS4 permit) regulations with developers in advance of project submittals to ensure those requirements are built in.
- IRWM program could serve as venue for addressing water management/land use issues.
- Water managers need to be involved in General Plan efforts by local jurisdictions. They also need to share their master planning with the local jurisdictions.
- Water managers can host coordination meetings with the local jurisdictions and other utilities to ensure coordination/timing of development and/or CIP projects.
- Water managers can provide staff support to local jurisdictions at Board/Council meetings to ensure their voice is heard.
- Water supply agencies should collaborate with local fire departments to ensure adequate planning for fire flows in new and redevelopment areas.
- Water supply agencies should also collaborate with local school districts to encourage early planning for recycled water systems for irrigation.

Group Discussion and Suggestions

- The Ahwahnee Water Principals can be incorporated by local jurisdictions into general and community plans to recognize water resource management issues. This allows for coordination at the policy level and the ordinance level.
- Ongoing coordination will enable design of multi-use flood control projects.
- Coordination between utilities and local jurisdictions can encourage similar policy adoption (across region) as it relates to water resources management.
- Hosts of an annual Water Resources/Land Use Planning Forum – APA, San Diego Canyonlands, SANDAG, APWA, City Managers, League of Cities, and ASCE.
- IRWM program may initiate preparation and circulation of regional draft ordinances and/or guidelines for use by all local cities.
- Water policies can either be integrated into general plans or adopted as separate element.
- Regional recycled water planning should be conducted at a sewer-shed scale with participation by water agencies, wastewater agencies, and land use authorities.

Next RAC Meeting

Our next RAC meeting will be held on Wednesday June 2, 2010 from 9:00am to 11:30am at SDCWA's Board Room.