



Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) Meeting #44

August 7, 2013

9:00 am – 11:30 am

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

NOTES

Attendance

RAC Members

Marsi Steirer, City of San Diego (chair)
Arne Sandvik, Padre Dam Municipal Water District
Anne Bamford, Industrial Environmental Association
Bill Hunter, Santa Fe Irrigation District
Bob Kennedy, Otay Water District/Metro Wastewater Joint Powers Authority
Crystal Najera, City of Vista (and alternate Ligeia Heagy)
Dave Harvey, Rural Community Assistance Corporation
Iovanka Todt for Dennis Bowling, Floodplain Management Association
Joey Randall for Kimberly Thorner, Olivenhain Municipal Water District
Katie Levy, SANDAG
Ken Weinberg, San Diego County Water Authority
Khalique Khan, U.S. Marine Corps Camp Pendleton (non-voting member)
Kimberly O'Connell, UCSD Clean Water Utility
Kirk Ammerman, City of Chula Vista
Leigh Johnson, University of California Cooperative Extension
Linda Flournoy, Planning and Engineering for Sustainability
Mark Umphres, Helix Water District (and alternate Brian Olney)
Mike Thornton, San Elijo Joint Powers Authority
Mo Lahsaie for Cari Dale, City of Oceanside
Patrick Crais, California Landscape Contractors Association-San Diego (and alternate Lawrence O'Leary)
Rob Hutsel, San Diego River Park Foundation
Robyn Badger, San Diego Zoological Society
Ron Mosher for Jennifer Sabine, Sweetwater Authority
Ronald Wootton, Buena Vista Lagoon Foundation
Troy Bankston, County of San Diego (and alternate Sheri McPherson)

RWMG Staff

Goldy Thach, City of San Diego
Jeff Pasek, City of San Diego
Mark Stephens, City of San Diego
Loisa Burton, San Diego County Water Authority
Mark Stadler, San Diego County Water Authority

Interested Parties to the RAC

Eddie Pech, California Department of Water Resources
Teji Sandhu, California Department of Water Resources
Lauma Jurkevics, California Department of Water Resources
Erica Ryan, City of San Marcos
Crystal Mohr, RMC Water and Environment
Roselyn Prickett, RMC Water and Environment
Sally Johnson, RMC Water and Environment
Terrell Breaux, City of San Diego
Stan Williams, Poseidon Water
Roshan Christeph, AMEC
Bryant Alvarado, Larry Walker Associates
Laura Carpenter, Brown and Caldwell

Welcome and Introductions

Ms. Marsi Steirer, City of San Diego, welcomed everyone to the meeting. Introductions were made around the room. Congratulations were given to Ms. Crystal Najera on the birth of her daughter. Thank you and goodbyes were said to Mr. Kirk Ammerman, who was attending his final RAC meeting.

DWR Update

Three DWR representatives were present: Mr. Eddie Pech, Ms. Teji Sandhu, and Ms. Lauma Jurkevics. Mr. Pech updated the RAC on the status of the Proposition 84 Implementation Grant – Round 2 award announcements. The grant awards are expected to be released in mid-September, approximately two weeks behind schedule. Mr. Pech noted that Proposition 1E-Round 2 grant awards are still on schedule for release in late August. He also said that the draft IRWM review is expected to be out in late September or early October.

Ms. Jurkevics announced that the Draft California Water Plan Update 2013 would be released for public comment soon. The 2013 Water Plan Updated would have more emphasis on climate change, adaptation and mitigation, and the water energy nexus. Ms. Jurkevics asked water agencies to get in touch with her if they had any information on the energy intensity for conveyance of water sourced from local surface water.

Other than edits to the Proposition 84-Round 2 schedule, Mr. Pech noted that the most up-to-date IRWM schedule from DWR is as follows:

Activities	Target Date
Local Groundwater Assistance Grants	
Announce Final Awards	June 2013
Round 2 Stormwater Flood Management Grant	
Announce Draft Recommendations for Public Review & Comment	June 2013
Announce Final Awards	August 2013
Round 2 Implementation Grant	
Announce Draft Recommendations for Public Review & Comment	August 2013
Announce Final Awards	October 2013
IRWM Plan Review Process	
Draft Process for Public Review & Comment	August 2013
Round 3 Implementation Grant (Pending Appropriation; no earlier than FY 14-15)	
Release Draft Program Guidelines & PSP	Summer 2014
Release Final Program Guidelines & PSP	Fall 2014
Applications Due	Winter 2014/2015
Announce Draft Recommendations for Public Review & Comment	Spring 2015
Announce Final Awards	Summer 2015

Questions/Comments

- Can a link be sent to stakeholders when the 2013 Draft California Water Plan Update 2013 is available for public comment?
 - *Yes, when the draft is released by DWR, we will send a notice out to all SDIRWM stakeholders via email.*
- Is it still true that once DWR releases the final awards for Proposition 84 and Proposition 1E awards, local project sponsors can begin working on reimbursable activities?
 - *Yes, that is true. However, costs cannot be invoiced to DWR until the final contract is signed, so there may be a substantial delay between when costs are incurred and when costs are reimbursed by DWR.*

Grant Administration

Ms. Loisa Burton, San Diego County Water Authority, provided an update on the status of the Proposition 50 Implementation Grant, the Proposition 84 Planning Grant, and the Proposition 84-Round 1 Implementation Grant. She noted three amendments to the Proposition 50 contract were being reviewed by DWR, with three additional amendments being processed by the San Diego County Water Authority. To date, approximately 40% of the Proposition 50 grant award amount has been billed to DWR. Ms. Burton noted that the Region had received reimbursement from DWR for the October 2012 invoice, but that it was short-paid by approximately \$800,000. The Proposition 84 Planning Grant submitted one minor amendment to DWR on August 1, 2013. Approximately 50% of the planning grant has been billed to DWR to-date. For the Proposition 84-Round 1 Implementation Grant, all but one local project sponsor agreements have been executed, with all projects already underway, and one project 95% completed.

Questions/Comments

- Can you elaborate on the October 2012 short-pay?
 - *The invoices were separated by DWR, so only one project received reimbursement. Clarification from Ms. Sandhu indicated that the October 2012 invoice included reimbursements for projects 2, 8, 9, and 10. Due to backlog at DWR, the invoices were separated by project and given to separate DWR reviewers to reduce processing time. Some clarification was needed for projects 2, 8, and 9, so these were delayed. DWR is working with the Water Authority to resolve questions for projects 2, 8, and 9 so that local project sponsors (LPS) can be reimbursed for those invoices.*
- The LPS for projects 2, 8, and 9 appreciate that DWR is working on creative solutions to address delay issues, and would like to see the same approach taken for amendments, as some projects have been waiting over a year for an amendment. It was stressed that communication with LPS is important to ensure that issues can be addressed in the most efficient manner possible.
 - *Ms. Sandhu acknowledged this, and stated that three amendments were ready to be filed that day, but it would take a few weeks to gather all necessary signatures.*
- The RAC was reminded that there would be an opportunity for a debriefing with DWR following the meeting.
- We have heard that the State Controller is not releasing funding at this time? Is that true? Will reimbursements be delayed further?
 - *The restrictions have been lifted, and reimbursements should not be affected.*
- Mr. Mark Stadler, San Diego County Water Authority, stated that he and Ms. Toby Roy, San Diego County Water Authority, had met with Ms. Sandhu and another DWR representative in Sacramento to discuss grants and how to improve the amendment and reimbursement processes. Both the Water Authority and DWR felt the meeting had been productive and will continue to work together to resolve invoicing and processing issues.

IRWM Housekeeping

Ms. Goldy Thach announced that there are three open seats on the RAC: Urban Disadvantaged Communities, Stormwater Management (South/East County), and Tribal. The RAC Selection Workgroup will reconvene to select new RAC members for these seats, using the guidelines presented in the RAC Charter, adopted in December 2012.

Questions/Comments

- Will the RAC Selection Workgroup select from existing applicants, or will they put out a call for applications?
 - *The workgroup will need to meet to decide, because the RAC Charter is unclear on this point. However, if the RAC would like to give specific direction to the workgroup, that should be done today.*
- Should the RAC provide direction to the workgroup now on the selection process or should the RAC defer the decision to the workgroup?

- *The RAC voted to approve deferring the decision to the Workgroup.*

Water Purification Demonstration Project Update

Mr. Jeff Pasek, City of San Diego, presented an update to the RAC on the City of San Diego's Water Purification Demonstration Project (WPDP). The WPDP began in 2007, and receives grant funding from the IRWM Program via Proposition 50. The WPDP is a pilot project that was designed to determine the feasibility of treating tertiary recycled water into purified water that could later be sent to a reservoir (San Vicente Reservoir), treated at a water treatment plant, and distributed into the potable water system (indirect potable reuse). Mr. Pasek noted that although the WPDP researched indirect potable reuse, if purified water were to be treated at a water treatment plant prior to entering an environmental buffer (the reservoir, or sometimes a groundwater basin), the process would be considered direct potable reuse. Mr. Pasek presented findings from the March 2013 Project Report that was produced after a year of pilot testing was completed at a demonstration-level Advanced Water Purification Facility located at the North City Water Reclamation Plant. Key findings of the WPDP include: 1) water produced at the facility was of higher quality than any other existing water source in San Diego County, 2) it was estimated that the cost to produce the purified water and convey it to the San Vicente Reservoir is \$2,000 per acre-foot, a reduction in costs to \$1,000 per acre-foot when considering the reduced volume of water sent to the ocean outfall at the Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant, and greenhouse gas emissions estimates. Mr. Pasek also presented public opinion data regarding potable reuse in San Diego, and noted that approval for the concept increased significantly from 2004 to 2012, with 73% in favor or strongly in favor of the process in 2012 vs. only 26% in 2004.

Questions/Comments

- Do the greenhouse gas emissions account for all the treatment activities, including the tertiary treatment and the treatment of blended water from the reservoir?
 - *No. The greenhouse gas emissions calculation only considers the emissions from the additional steps of treating the purified water and conveyance of purified water to the reservoir. Because additional tertiary-treated recycled water would not be produced to produce purified water and the water from San Vicente Reservoir is already treated prior to delivery to customers, these steps were not included in the greenhouse gas calculations.*
- Does the greenhouse gas calculation consider the addition of onsite solar panels or other implementation items that could offset emissions?
 - *No. The estimation considered use of electricity off of the grid, but the City may consider other implementation items that could reduce emissions.*
- Does the cost estimate include the debt service for the project?
 - *No. The costs include just the capital and operations and maintenance costs.*
- The City of San Diego was commended for their work on educating the public, and their commitment to studying potable reuse in spite of strong opposition to the concept when the idea for the WPDP was first presented.

- Is groundwater recharge, rather than blending in the reservoir, an option for an environmental buffer? Why did the City choose to study the reservoir?
 - *The groundwater basins in San Diego are not large enough to accommodate the volume of water that would be produced.*
- Does this project, if implemented on a full-scale, mean that San Diego will only have a single color pipe (i.e., the purple pipe system would no longer be necessary)?
 - *The water produced through this process would be part of the drinking water supply, not the recycled water supply – so this water would not be distributed via purple pipe. The City's Recycled Water Study analyzed long-term options for water reuse; those options analyzed both non-potable (traditional recycled water) and potable reuse as part of the City's water supply.*
- Isn't it true that traditional recycled water is cheaper for customers, because it requires less treatment?
 - *Future recycled water costs to customers is not easy to estimate, but is likely to increase in the future, whether or not this project is implemented fully.*
- Has there been consideration of blending the purified water with existing water sources to reduce salinity in supplies?
 - *Regardless of this project, the City is committed to meeting a goal of 1000 milligrams per liter of total dissolved solids (TDS) or less.*
- If the full-scale project were to be implemented, what percentage of the total water supply would be provided by this water source (purified water)?
 - *If the 15 million gallons per day (MGD) project were implemented, the project would be able to serve about 8% of the City's total water demands. If the larger 83 MGD project were implemented, this would serve about 40% of the City's water demands.*
- It was noted the low salinity of the purified water is highly valuable to the Region. There would be reduced damage from corrosion to the potable water infrastructure, which would be another economic benefit of the project.
- It was noted that this project could reduce the need for redundant recycled water infrastructure (purple pipe infrastructure), because the purified water would be included into the City's existing drinking water system. Reducing the need for redundant infrastructure could reduce costs as well.
- Do costs include building the plant to full capacity?
 - *Yes. All capital costs were included.*

San Diego IRWM Plan Update

Presentation of 2013 IRWM Plan Comments

Ms. Rosalyn Prickett, RMC Water and Environment, presented the major comments received during the public comment period for the 2013 IRWM Plan. She noted that the comment period had closed on July 31, 2013, and no more comments were being accepted. She informed the RAC that over 100 major comments had been received through the four Watershed Workshops that were held in July and the written comments that were received, and over 250 minor comments

were received. All comments will be appended to the final 2013 IRWM Plan so that commenters can see how their comments were or were not addressed in the Plan.

Comments were categorized as “major” (e.g., suggested additions, correction of information, clarification of information) or “minor” (e.g., grammar, edits, consistency of numbers). Ms. Prickett then presented major changes and how these changes and comments would be incorporated into the final draft of the 2013 IRWM Plan. Major comments were received on 9 of the 11 plan chapters, with Chapter 10, Data and Technical Analysis and Chapter 11, Implementation, being the only two chapters that did not receive major comments. The following provides an overview of the conversation that occurred regarding each Plan Chapter and the major comments associated with each chapter.

Questions/Comments

Chapter 1, Introduction

- If discussion of the “modern water cycle” and more discussion of integration is added to the plan, a discussion of trade-offs should also be included. For example, the discussion should be a balance between the benefits of modern infrastructure and the damage they can impart to the environment due to dams, etc.
- The proposed graphic of the modern water cycle should include a cross-section of the ground to show infiltration and subsurface water movement.
- In the discussion of rainfall, discuss the range of rainfall across the region upfront, rather than just in Chapter 3. This should be added to the second bullet in the beginning of Chapter 1.

Chapter 2, Vision and Objectives

- Was there outreach to Sanitary Districts and agencies dealing with wastewater effluent?
Did not see comments from these groups.
 - *Outreach conducted for the Plan included notification at RAC meetings and through the IRWM stakeholder email list. Every person on the email list was notified when the public draft of the 2013 IRWM Plan was released for comments. While outreach was conducted to a wide variety of individuals, we did not receive comments from all groups.*
- Is the proposed metric for Objective E regarding AFY of water produced for potable reuse in addition to the existing metric, or will it replace the existing metric?
 - *The proposed changes would be additions – there are no plans to remove existing metrics from the IRWM Plan.*

Chapter 3, Region Description

- It may not be technically correct to say that reduced irrigation and runoff leads to reduced pollution load. The pollution still exists, just without runoff there are reduced dry weather flows. Pollution still enters waterways during the first big rain event (first flush).
- Agree that there is a lot of messaging that water is a bad thing – there is a difference between over-irrigation and rain. The key issue in San Diego is that over-irrigation causes flows during the dry season. The affects are therefore time and site dependent.

- However, in some agencies (ex: City of Oceanside), there have been noticeable reductions in nutrient and pollutant loading associated with water conservation. That is, dry weather flows and associated pollutant loading have been substantially reduced.
- Also need to acknowledge that over irrigation can cause habitat-type changes. This becomes an additional issue – if over-irrigation artificially creates wetland habitat then agencies must regulate accordingly.
 - *The IRWM Plan will make sure to balance the discussion of water conservation and water quality improvements – discussion will focus on wet weather vs. dry weather flows. Will acknowledge dry weather flow impacts, such as habitat changes.*
- Sometimes rain gardens take more water to sustain than the benefits they provide. It is important to note the need to choose plants that are tolerant to our climate, and take into account the water needs of rain gardens.
- Also it is important to consider that rain gardens do not work when infiltration is not working – it is about the whole system, land, etc., not just the amount of irrigation.
- The no-net runoff requirement of the 2013 MS4 permit may impede development in parts of the Region. May want to consider referencing the 2013 MS4 permit in the Regulatory chapter. Discuss how development and construction practices could change, and how the issue of managing stormwater runoff may change.
- It does not make sense to say FEMA has removed floodplain designations and then to discuss those areas as floodplains. Please make note to only include factual information about FEMA-designated floodplains, not commentary about how people interpret those designations.
- The DAC section had lots of comments, primarily that the map in the 2013 Plan does not accurately reflect DACs in the Region. The map uses 2010 Census tract data and 2013 Census block data – it was suggested that project proponents or other interested parties who believe they serve a DAC be allowed to conduct income surveys to provide evidence that an area is a DAC. It was mentioned that this does not meet the definition provided by DWR Guidelines, and may not be accepted in DWR grant applications.
 - The problem with the map is scale. It should be possible to use smaller areas and still be able to back up DAC designations with Census data.
 - It is important for the plan to take a position on the appropriate size area for analysis. That is, how many economically disadvantaged households does it take to constitute a disadvantaged community? 10? 100? 1,000? The IRWM Plan should take a stance on this to guide future project selection workgroups.
 - Contact the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) about receiving finer-scale data that is still technically defensible.
 - May want to discuss DAC designation in terms of both grant requirements and how the Region defines DACs. Do not limit the Plan to DWR grant requirements when discussing DACs.
 - *DWR informed the RAC that the Census tract level is the standard, but is a DWR minimum. DWR has a target for DACs when assessing grants, so if it can be justified and is defensible, then DWR will accept it.*

Chapter 4, Tribal Nations

The RAC did not have any comments on the Tribal chapter comments or how they would be addressed.

Chapter 5, Watershed Characterizations

- The “Carlsbad Watershed” is not a watershed, it is a Hydrologic Unit.
 - *For consistency in the Plan, the term “watershed” is used, but it is acknowledged that Carlsbad is not a true watershed, but is a collection of parallel watersheds.*
- Mitigation type should be clarified (greenhouse gas/climate change mitigation versus habitat/land use mitigation)

Chapter 6, Governance and Stakeholders

The RAC did not have any comments on the Governance and Stakeholders chapter comments or how they would be addressed.

Chapter 7, Regional Coordination

The RAC did not have any comments on the Regional Coordination chapter comments or how they would be addressed.

Chapter 8, Resource Management

- Be clear when adding a resource management strategy that is outside the list provided in DWR’s guidelines that it is a local/regional strategy and not a DWR strategy
- May want to look at the 2013 California Water Plan Update strategies
 - *The 2013 California Water Plan Update will not be available before the 2013 IRWM Plan is adopted*

Chapter 9, Project Evaluation

- There are projects that the San Diego IRWM Program considers DAC projects that do not meet DWR’s requirements. Need to make it clear that those projects have always been selected due to their regional importance. It is still possible in future rounds of funding to fund locally-important and recognized DAC projects that do not meet the DWR definition.
- Include a statement that the weighting of the scoring matrix is subject to change, and is dependent upon different grant opportunities. This applies beyond IRWM grants in the event that the region ever decides to submit a regional application outside of the IRWM Program.
- Can the project scoring be open-ended? Can the RAC expand on the scoring table?
 - *Yes, the scoring table includes an “Other” category that is designed for additional scoring categories to be determined by the RAC or Project Selection Workgroup*
 - This should be made explicit to project proponents and plan leaders so they are aware that the scoring table in the IRWM Plan may not be the most up-to-date version.

Recommendation of Approval of 2013 IRWM Plan

Ms. Steirer called for the RAC to discuss recommendation of approval of the 2013 IRWM Plan, with comments addressed. Ms. Steirer noted that the RAC is being asked for approval during this meeting due to the RWMG approval schedule. The Proposition 84 Planning Grant that is being used to partially fund development of the 2013 IRWM Plan requires that the plan be completed

by October 31, 2013. In order to meet this schedule, the governing bodies of the RWMG agencies need to have a RAC-approved version of the Plan ready by early September, 2013.

Questions/Comments

- Were there any comments from the public that indicated a reason not to recommend adoption?
 - *No. Today we have discussed all major comments received regarding the Plan. None of these comments indicated that the Plan should not be adopted without certain changes incorporated.*
- When will the appendix of comments and how comments were addressed be available for review?
 - *The comment matrix will be ready for review on August 23, 2013.*
- Would like to see comment that Plan benefits the entire California community, not just the Region. Should mention SBX7-7 and AB32.
- There is some concern that comments sent by the Padre Dam Municipal Water District were not incorporated. Can you please explain why they were not incorporated?
 - *The Padre Dam comments will be incorporated – they were considered minor comments that did not require RAC review, and were therefore not mentioned today.*
- Will minor comments be incorporated into the plan?
 - *For the most part, yes. There are some instances when suggestions or additions were made that were due to a confusion on behalf of the commenter. Instead of incorporating those changes, information will be added for clarity.*
- From a public perception point of view, what is public perception of the IRWM Plan? To what extent is the Plan seen as an integrated planning document for the Region vs. a mechanism to secure grant funding? There is concern that if we include too much information about issues such as DACs as they relate to DWR for grant purposes that this discussion takes away from people viewing the Plan for its true value: regional integrated planning.
 - *Will clarify instances where we discuss items such as DACs and explain their regional importance vs. the requirements established by DWR for grant purposes.*
 - *Will make more mention of our Speakers Bureau process: the RWMG agencies are available to come to your organization and provide a presentation on the IRWM process. Let Mark Stadler know if you would like to have a Speakers Bureau presentation for your organization!*
- The floor was opened to the public in attendance at the meeting:
 - The City of San Marcos did not see their comments addressed in the Plan, as presented. Would like to understand either how their comments will be addressed or why they will not be addressed. Would like to see voluntary “outside the box” activities to address water issues be addressed in the Plan. This is an important stakeholder involvement aspect that should be included in the Plan.
 - *The voluntary planning efforts associated with Lake San Marcos will be highlighted in the Plan. As mentioned previously, an appendix to the 2013 IRWM Plan will be a matrix with received comments and proposed responses.*

All commenters will be made aware of how their comments were or were not addressed.

Mr. Kirk Ammerman made a motion to recommend the 2013 IRWM Plan with comments incorporated. Ronald Wootton seconded the motion. The motion passed. 22 yes to 0 no.

IRWM Program Next Steps

Ms. Prickett discussed the next steps for the 2013 IRWM Plan. The Final Draft of the 2013 IRWM Plan will be released on September 6, 2013, with approval by the RWMG governing boards occurring between September 9, 2013 and October 31, 2013. The next step will be the Proposition 84 Implementation Grant – Round 3 project selection process. The strategic integration workshop is expected to be held in January 2014. RAC meetings will continue to be held bi-monthly, if there are suggestions or requests for discussion topics or presentations, please notify Ms. Prickett.

Questions/Comments

- How much money is still available to the Region from Proposition 84?
 - *Approximately \$45 million remains for San Diego, and if DWR gets approval from the state assembly, this money will be released in a single round. The next round of funding is expected in late 2014.*
- Project proponents should hold off on project design until after the integration workshop – it is easier to integrate projects that are not finished with design, and cheaper in the long-run.
- The Region should talk about the successes of Proposition 84 and Proposition 50, and identify gaps that have not yet been addressed by projects when considering moving forward.

Next RAC Meeting –October 2, 2013

The next RAC meeting will be held on Wednesday October 2, 2013 from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. at San Diego County Water Authority Board Room (4677 Overland Ave., San Diego, CA 92123).

RAC meetings to be held in 2013 are scheduled for the following dates:

- Wednesday, October 2nd
- Wednesday, December 4th