



Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) Meeting #65

December 7, 2016

9:00 am – 11:30 pm

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

NOTES

Attendance

RAC Members

George Adrian, City of San Diego (chair)
Alex Yescas for Mike Seits, Floodplain Management Association
Ann Van Leer, Escondido Creek Conservancy
Bob Kennedy, Otay Water District
Brian Olney, Helix Water District
Chris Helmer, City of Imperial Beach
Crystal Najera, City of Encinitas
Greg Thomas, Rincon del Diablo Municipal Water District
Jennifer Hazard for Olga Morales, RCAC
Jennifer Sabine, Sweetwater Authority
Jona Lee for Jack Simes, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
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)
Kelly Craig for Robyn Badger, Zoological Society of San Diego
Kimberly O'Connell, University of California – San Diego Clean Water
Leigh Johnson, University of California Cooperative Extension
Michael McSweeney (and alternate S. Wayne Rosenbaum), Building Industry Association
Mike Thornton, SEJPA
Oscar Romo for Jennifer Hazard, University of California – San Diego
Patrick Crais, California Landscape Contractors Association
Phil Pryde, San Diego River Park Foundation
Ronald Wootton, Buena Vista Lagoon Foundation
Sarah Pierce, San Diego Association of Governments
Stephanie Gaines for Ramin Abidi, County of San Diego
Toby Roy (and alternate Mark Stadler), San Diego County Water Authority
Travis Pritchard, San Diego Coastkeeper

RWMG Staff and Consultants

Andrew Funk, City of San Diego
Goldy Herbon, San Diego County Water Authority
Jen Sajor, RMC Water and Environment
Loisa Burton, San Diego County Water Authority
Mark Stephens, City of San Diego
Roselyn Prickett, RMC Water and Environment
Ruth Kolb, City of San Diego
Sally Johnson, RMC Water and Environment

Interested Parties to the RAC

David Pohl, ESA
Michelle Berens, Helix Water District
Antonia Estevez-Olea, Larry Walker Associates
Boushra Salem, City of Chula Vista
Maria Margarita Borja, City of San Diego
Hengameh Maher, City of San Diego
Dawnn Jackson, City of San Diego
Michelle Huynh, City of San Diego
Roshan Christoph, Amec Foster Wheeler
Roberto Yano, JPA/SD Metro
Tony Hancock, Brown & Caldwell
Martha Davis, City of San Diego
Malik Tamimi, City of La Mesa
Cat Rom, City of San Diego
Jennifer Carroll, City of San Diego
Lindsey Sheehan, ESA
Ruth de la Rosa, County of San Diego
Amanda Sousa, San Diego Housing Commission
Matt Widelski, City of Encinitas
Anne Bamford, IEA
Lois Yum, City of San Diego
Kyrsten Rosenthal, City of San Diego

Welcome and Introductions

Mr. George Adrian, City of San Diego, welcomed everyone to the meeting. Introductions were made around the room.

Project Completion Reports

Three Proposition 50 Project Completion Reports were presented.

Project 6 Recycled Water Distribution System Expansion, Parklands Retrofit and IPR/Reservoir Augmentation – Ramil Arroyo and Joseph Quicho, City of San Diego

Mr. Ramil Arroyo and Mr. Joseph Quicho, City of San Diego, presented on the Proposition 50, Project 6 – Recycled Water Distribution System Expansion, Parklands Retrofit and IPR/Reservoir Augmentation project. The total project cost was \$18.7 million, with \$4.8 million received in grant funding. There were three components of the project – 6A (Recycled Water Distribution System Expansion), 6B (Parklands Retrofit), and 6C (Indirect Potable Reuse/Reservoir Augmentation).

Component 6A – Recycled Water Distribution System Expansion, was completed in 2013. The project constructed a five mile-long recycled water main along Camino Del Sur, which connected 80 new recycled water sites in western Carmel Valley. The project provided recycled water to schools, retail sites, home owners associations, commercial sites, parks, street medians, Caltrans, and golf courses. This component provides an estimated 1,100 AFY recycled water.

Component 6B – Parklands Retrofit was located in the Mira Mesa Community Planning Area at Westview Neighborhood Park. The retrofit included installing recycled water pipelines, upgrading electrical service and booster pump, and installing a recycled water meter. Since 2007, the number of City sites using recycled water have increased from 23 to 114. Project funds were also used to train park staff for use of recycled water.

Component 6C – Indirect Potable Reuse/Reservoir Augmentation (IPR/RA) Demonstration Project and Extended Testing, aimed to evaluate the feasibility of advanced treatment technology for IPR/RA. It was also used to evaluate the viability of a full-scale IPR/RA project and to perform extended testing on the additional treatment steps ozone and biological activated carbo (BAC). Key components of the project were the Independent Advisory Panel (IAP), San Vicente Reservoir Limnology and Conveyance Pipeline Studies, construction of the Advanced Treatment Plant (demonstration plant), public outreach and education, and extended testing at the demonstration plant. Upon completion of the demonstration plant in 2013, the project received an amendment for continued testing and a final report was developed in 2015. Extended testing showed that purified water met all federal and state drinking water standards and was comparable to Orange County's Groundwater Replenishment System. The IAP provided expert peer review for all technical, scientific, and regulatory aspects of the demonstration plant and unanimously concluded that project satisfied all City Council directives. The project's public outreach and education program was extensive and very successful. As of September 2016, a total of 431 community presentations, 143 community events, and 284 stakeholder interview had taken place, with more than 10,200 visitors to the demonstration plant.

Questions/Comments:

- I am a supporter of potable reuse, and am intrigued about people's reaction to IPR.
 - In 2004, there was only a 24% acceptance rate for potable reuse. Now there is 73% acceptance. More people are on board with potable reuse.

- In terms of the pilot plant, what was the cost per acre-foot for conveyance from San Vicente Reservoir?
 - We are now looking at Miramar for reservoir augmentation instead of San Vicente Reservoir. We are still defining those costs, so we do not have a number on hand but it is comparable to imported water.
- Will the demonstration project going to continue to exist?
 - Yes, it will be operational for full-scale design.
- What was the grant award?
 - The total project cost was \$18.7 million. \$4.8 million of this was grant funding, so approximately 25% of the total project cost was funded with the grant.

Project 9: Northern San Diego County Invasive Non-Native Species Control Program – Karla Standridge, Mission Resource Conservation District

Ms. Karla Standridge, Mission Resource Conservation District, presented on the Proposition 50, Project 9 – Northern San Diego County Invasive Non-Native Species Control Program. The program successfully eradicated over 600 acres of invasive, non-native plants from four target watersheds: San Dieguito, San Luis Rey, Santa Margarita, and Carlsbad Hydrological Units (HU). The four target species were *Arundo donax* (giant reed), *Cortaderia selloana* (pampas grass), *Lepidium latifolium* (perennial pepperweed), and *Tamarisk ramosissimum* (salt cedar). Program work typically occurred from September 15th to March 15th each year, outside of bird nesting season. However, due to drought and earlier plant dormancy, the project received regulatory approval to begin in August. Program work consisted of obtaining permits, conducting outreach and coordination with landowners, administering herbicide treatments, reducing biomass, and re-vegetation with native species. Due to the drought, re-vegetation efforts in the Carlsbad HU resulted in only a 50% survival rate. Removal of invasive species resulted in an estimated net water savings of 5,738 AFY, which helps to develop and maintain a diverse mix of water resources (i.e., increased groundwater recharge). Other project benefits include reduction in sources of pollutants/environmental stressors, habitat protection, restoration, and maintenance, and optimization of water-based recreational opportunities. The project will continue to monitor and re-treat target invasive, non-native plants primarily using regional Natural Community Conservation Planning funds distributed through the SANDAG TransNet program. The watershed programs will also be supported by federal, state, and local sources.

Questions/Comments:

- Where were the pictures of the San Dieguito watershed taken?
 - An agricultural property near the Safari Park.
- Why did you expand the project to include eucalyptus removal?
 - We did eucalyptus removal in the San Dieguito watershed. This species was not in the original proposal, but when more money became available, we submitted an amendment to add it for that watershed.
- Was there a way to avoid using herbicides?
 - We would have loved to avoid using herbicides. Due to funding constraints, the most effective means of removing these species was with herbicides. We chose herbicides

that were EPA-approved for aquatic areas. At one site, we removed invasive species from an organic farm. At that site, we used a cut treatment in which we applied a smaller amount of herbicide directly on the trunk. Although we used less herbicide at that site, the treatment was also less effective. We eventually will need to retreat the area.

- Are you funding the monitoring treatment efforts? Or are the landowners?
 - Because we have the blanket permits, we are finding the funds and performing the monitoring treatment. It is not feasible for the private owners to do the monitoring treatment due to the required permits.
- What was the total project cost?
 - Including amendments, \$1.2 million was provided through IRWM grant funds. The total project cost was over \$3 million.
- How are you preventing the reintroduction of these species?
 - We will be monitoring sites extensively and there are retreatment funds available. We are trying to be cost-effective, especially with *Arundo*, and working upstream to downstream to reduce potential for re-establishment.

Project 12: San Diego Basin Water Supply Adaptation to Climate Change – Goldy Herbon, San Diego County Water Authority

Ms. Goldy Herbon, San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA), presented on the Proposition 50, Project 12 – San Diego Basin Water Supply Adaptation to Climate Change. The original project, developed in 2008, aimed to provide initial design and work plan for a conveyance system between San Vicente, El Capitan, Loveland, Sweetwater, and Murray Reservoirs. Due to changes in circumstances, the study was removed and the City of San Diego Public Utilities Department (SDPUD) leveraged other funds to submit a San Diego Basin Infrastructure Study to U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) in 2013. Unlike the original project, the new study encompassed the entire San Diego IRWM Region and its infrastructure. The project was a response to a study confirming shortfalls between projected water supplies and demands in the Colorado River Basin. It was awarded \$1 million from USBR with a cost share of \$1,105,606 from Proposition 50 funding and SDPUD. The project title was changed to the San Diego Basin Water Supply Adaptation to Climate Change Project to reflect the portion of the scope that was completed by the end of the Prop 50 grant agreement in 2015.

The purpose of the revised project was to assess the potential effects of climate change impacts within the San Diego IRWM Region. This was done by evaluating water supply and demand conditions in the region under future climate change conditions. The work completed under this project included a Water Supply and Demand Projections Report, Climate Change and Hydrology Report, and an analysis of relevant data and measures of supply reliability from the Colorado River Basin Study and the Sacramento San Joaquin Basin Study. One major challenge for this project was successfully managing multiple funding sources – San Diego IRWM Program and the WaterSmart Program. Each funding program had different budget schedules, reporting requirements, timelines, and reimbursement processes.

The final project had a total budget cost reduction of about \$900,000 and a grant funding reduction of \$22,000 as compared to the original project. Three remaining tasks are outstanding, but are in progress. Task 2.3, which examines water supply and demand under current and future climate through

modeling, is almost complete. Task 2.4 will evaluate structural and non-structural concepts for addressing supply-demand gaps. The staff technical team invited all members of the RAC and the public to participate in the next Basin Study Stakeholder Meeting on January 31, 2017 at 1 pm in the SDCWA Board Room. Concepts from Task 2.3 and Task 2.4 will be included in the final reports to Congress with an appraisal-level analysis in Spring 2018.

Questions/Comments:

- Where are the deliverables available?
 - The webpage will be provided to Rosalyn, and she will send it to the RAC.
- Were there any policy changes from this project?
 - No, but it may inform future policies and highlights priorities. The report is not meant to be a regulatory document. The Los Angeles Basin Study focuses on storm water capture because that was a priority in that basin. The San Diego Basin Study will focus on what the stakeholders choose to focus on.
- How does this study support SDCWA's urban studies?
 - The Basin Study builds on work by the SDCWA SIM Model used for the Water Master Facility Plan. The study will take it further to figure out what facilities need collaboration. It will also be used to figure out which projects are cost effective and best for the region.
- The Water Facilities Master Plan 2013 overestimated the supply-demand gap, and the 2015 Urban Water Master Plan dialed down from those calculations. Why would you use the same model as those plans?
 - We modified the model with 2015 data.
- There is currently no supply gap, so there is concern that SDCWA is planning to spend big dollars on projects that are not necessary. For example, the Camp Pendleton desalination facility is expensive but is not necessary to meet a known supply gap.
 - Camp Pendleton is a back-up facility, and will not be built if it is not necessary. Currently, there are no plans to build that facility.
- The Los Angeles Basin has different characteristic than the San Diego Basin. Will your plan take local geology for groundwater recharge potential into consideration?
 - Correct, every region is different and we are definitely aware of this.

San Diego Regional Stormwater Resource Plan (SWRP) – David Pohl, ESA and Ruth de la Rosa, County of San Diego

Mr. David Pohl, ESA, and Ms. Ruth de la Rosa, County of San Diego, presented on the Regional Stormwater Resource Plan (Regional SWRP), which is being funded under a grant received by the County of San Diego through the IRWM Program under Proposition 1. The SWRP was developed per State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) guidelines and was designed to create more competitive projects state-wide grant funding opportunities. The purpose of the plan was to identify and prioritize projects with multi-benefits, including storm water benefits, that best meet the identified priorities of individual watershed. The Regional SWRP needs to be completed within 90 days of grant

award, which was announced on December 1, 2016. The Final Regional SWRP is expected to be submitted to the State Board and integrated into the IRWM Plan on February 28, 2017. The current list of projects in the Regional SWRP, which were submitted through the last call for projects, will be included in the Final Regional SWRP. However, because we will be officially tracking projects through the online OPTI database, projects can be added or updated at any time. An extensive analysis took place for each submitted project and the list of projects selected based on identified regional and watershed goals. The Draft Regional SWRP meets the State's Guidelines (Water Code §10560 et seq.) and provides tools for regional and watershed collaboration to develop integrated multi-benefit projects. A checklist is provided at the end of each chapter to ensure that projects included in the Regional SWRP address important issues identified within each chapter. Mr. Pohl provided a brief explanation of the SWRP checklist went through an example Green Street project to explain the level of analysis used in the project selection process.

The Draft Regional SWRP and a comment matrix is available on the IRWM website. Comments are due to Ms. de la Rosa by Friday, December 23, 2016.

Ms. de la Rosa described the 40 projects listed in the Draft Regional SWRP and the distribution of projects across seven of the nine watersheds within San Diego IRWM Region. It was reiterated that additional opportunities to submit or update projects will occur before future rounds of Proposition 1 funding through the IRWM OPTI database. Programmatic level projects will also be considered with the criteria that all subprojects have similar benefits and metrics. The Final Regional SWRP will have the current list of projects as an appendix.

- The Draft SWRP is available for Public Review here: <http://sdirwmp.org/irwm-planning>
- The SDIRWM OPTI Project Database is located here: <http://irwm.rmcwater.com/sd/login.php>
- Additional information on the State Board's Storm Water Grant Program can be found here: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/swgp/prop1/

Questions/Comments:

- Were the projects submitted to OPTI hand scored or automatically scored?
 - Automatically scored.
- What is the intention of the Proposition 1 funding to use this as an eligibility requirement? How does this funding relate to general funding?
 - There is an eligibility requirement for projects that apply for Proposition 1 funding that all projects with stormwater capture or water quality elements need to be listed in the SWRP. Stormwater projects funded through the IRWM program also need to be on the list, along with projects that are conservation with water quality improvements. The OPTI database is used to help projects apply for IRWM funding, so it is also being used for the SWRP project list to assist with this process.
 - The SWRP must also be accepted into the IRWM Plan for projects to be eligible for funding.
- There is skepticism about the feasibility of stormwater projects in this county. Will projects score better if it includes some sort of technical feasibility study?
 - The SWRP is a good starting point; it starts the conversation of what is feasible in San Diego. Within the SWRP, there is a level playing field for projects in the region.
- What kind of comments are being requested for the Draft SWRP?

Visit us at www.sdirwmp.org

- Because the SWRP follows State Board guidelines, a lot of it is not flexible. However, if any tools or explanations are recommended, they could be added. Or if more examples are needed to help clarify the evaluation process for project sponsors, those could be added as well.
- Is there any sense of there being a threshold in the process that will determine whether or not a project is competitive state-wide based on points earned?
 - We want to look at the project on a watershed level first in order to make sure it is a multi-benefit project. It is not really meant to eliminate projects, but rather should be used to improve projects based on multiple benefits and quantification of benefits. A low score should encourage project sponsors to look at how to improve their project.
- Three stormwater projects were recently awarded about \$1-3 million each.
- Is Federal Boulevard a tributary of Chollas Creek?
 - Yes, it is the headwaters of Chollas Creek.
- Will water from Green Streets project percolate without harm? Have you done a soil analysis?
 - Have not gotten that far in the soil analysis.
- With limited resources, there should be some screening for cost effectiveness or “bang for your buck” projects. We should fund the biggest issues first. We should focus on what really makes sense.
- Other stormwater plans are being prepared. How will scores be compared state-wide?
 - Funding awarded to projects with the most impact, which is why we focus on multi-benefit projects. Projects should be identified and prioritized in the SWRP. In San Diego, the SWRP is a regional plan, but is still focused on a watershed basis. The outcomes and project assessment will be similar across all plans because all of them are based on the same guidelines.
- Is there any discussion that Supplemental Environmental Project (SEP) money can be used here in San Diego?
 - Not sure, Regional Water Quality Control Board could look at a consolidated list, but I do not know.
 - Chiara Clemente’s presentation at the last RAC meeting was about the SEP call for projects. The RWMG is in talks with her about how to add these projects to OPTI.
- The Draft SWRP document crashes on the website whenever I try to read through it. What version of Adobe is being used?
 - The document is pretty big. We can divide it by section so that it does not crash.
- Many of the projects on the Project List could benefit from the Floating Island.

IRWM Grant Program

RAC Membership Update

Mr. Mark Stadler, SDCWA, presented an update on the RAC member selection process for the 2017-2020 term. A total of 15 applications were submitted with at least one applicant for 12 of the 13 open positions. There were no applicants for the Agriculture seat. Six of the 15 applicants have previously served on the RAC, and the remaining nine applicants have never been RAC members. The RAC Membership Workgroup was scheduled to meet later that afternoon to select the new members. New

members will begin their terms at the February RAC meeting with a new member orientation prior to that meeting. Certificates of appreciation for end-of-term RAC members were given out.

IRWM Planning Grant Award

An update was provided on the Proposition 1 IRWM Planning Grant. A draft award of \$250,000 was recently announced to update the 2013 San Diego IRWM Plan. The IRWM Plan Update will incorporate new guidelines, policies, and regulations, including the development of a Storm Water Capture Feasibility Study (SWCFS). The anticipated final award is expected in January 2017 and a kick-off IRWM Plan Update meeting is planned for mid-2017.

DAC Planning Grant Status

Mr. Travis Pritchard, San Diego Coastkeeper presented an update on the DAC Planning Grant. The DAC Planning Grant application was postponed because one of the local project sponsors (LPS), San Luis Rey Watershed Council, decided not to pursue grant funding. The Project Selection Workgroup (PSW) held a reallocation meeting in November to consider three alternate projects from the “Alternate Project List” established in the last PSW meeting. The PSW recommended \$325,000 of grand funding for The Escondido Creek Conservancy’s (TECC) *Storm Water Quality for Grape Day Park DACs* project. The project includes restoration of a portion of the Escondido Creek that runs through Grape Day Park, a central park in the City of Escondido. With the help of a prominent non-profit organization, it also integrates a youth mentorship program as its outreach component to develop student stewards. An “Outreach Plus” task was also added for the development of a Funding Area-wide DAC Needs Assessment that builds on DAC involvement conducted by LPS. The needs assessment, requesting \$120,000, will also involve DACs that were not previously engaged in IRWM Programs and will identify their water and wastewater issues. With the addition of the TECC project, DAC Outreach Plus, and an increased grant administration budget of \$259,550, the total proposed grant request is \$5,536,550.

The RAC was asked to discuss the proposed changes to the application package and vote on the PSW’s recommendation. Mr. Mark Stadler asked the RAC to consider increasing the TECC project’s grant funding by \$30,000 for a total of \$355,000, the initial amount requested by TECC. The RAC held a discussion and voted on the PSW’s recommendation on the DAC Planning Grant.

Vote: 20 Yes. Passed.

It was also noted that Travis Pritchard will be moving and will leave his current position at San Diego Coastkeeper, and will be naming a replacement for his seat on the RAC.

Questions/Comments:

- I am concerned that there were no application for the Agriculture seat on the RAC. There were no previous RAC members applying?
 - No one from the Farm Bureau interested.
 - I can reach out to get some interest.
- In terms of increasing TECC funding, does the additional \$30,000 come from Proposition 1 funds?
 - Yes.
- Why was funding reduced in the first place?

Visit us at www.sdirwmp.org

- The project listed “indirect” costs, which might have hurt the project’s chance of getting funded. The issue was discussed with SDCWA’s grant administrator, and it was determined these costs were acceptable.
- Who was on the Project Selection Workgroup?
 - Mark Stadler, Cathy Peironi, Stephanie Gaines, Travis Pritchard, Roy Roy, and Olga Morales, along with alternates
- TECC is excited about the project and will be working closely with the City of Escondido on this.

IRWM Grant Administration

Ms. Loisa Burton, SDCWA, 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. Ten out of 38 projects that received Proposition 84 Rounds 1, 2, and 3 funding have been completed or are at least 80% complete. A total of \$40.5 million in grant funding (out of \$89.6 million awarded) has been billed to DWR. The LPS Kick-off Meeting for projects funded under Proposition 84, Round 4 was held on November 17, 2016.

SDCWA is developing a Funding Reallocation Policy which will provide guidance for reallocation of grant funding. RAC approval of the final policy will follow at a future RAC meeting. Melissa Sparks is no longer with DWR, and Erik Goodman has been named DWR’s new Regional Area Representative for the San Diego IRWM Region. He is a water resources engineer from the IRWM Assistance Branch Section.

Questions/Comments:

- Will the Draft Funding Reallocation Policy be circulated before the next meeting?
 - Yes, we can do that.
- In reference to the Rincon Customer-Driven Demand Management Project (Proposition 84, Round 2), did the WaterSmart portal detect leaks in your (Rincon) system or the customer’s system?
 - Leaks were found in customer systems. The software allows users to set benchmarks and we notify them of any anomalies. An estimated 3 million gallons are saved per year. We had a 3% system water loss.
- Who did you go through for the AMI?
 - It was a capital project and it took three and a half years to replace all the meters in the system. There are a lot of choices available, but we used Badger Meters.

Public Comments

None.

Summary and Next Steps

Next RAC Meeting:

- February 1, 2017 – 9-11:30am

2017 Meeting Schedule:

- April 5
- June 7
- August 2
- October 4
- December 6