



San Diego IRWM Summit

February 29, 2012 ○ 11:30pm - 4:00pm
Valencia Park/Malcolm X Library
5148 Market Street
San Diego, CA 92114

DRAFT NOTES

Attendance

Adrian, George, City of San Diego
Agahi, Sara, County of San Diego
Arroyo, Ramil, City of San Diego
Badger, Robyn, Zoological Society of San Diego
Bardin, Mike, Santa Fe Irrigation District
Bauer, Stephanie, Port of San Diego
Beebe, Jack, Fallbrook Public Utilities Dept
Berlin, Jessica, Katz and Associates
Bluman, Patricia, City Place Planning
Bowling, Dennis, Rick Engineering Co.
Brogadir, Daniel, County of San Diego
Burr-Rosenthal, Kyrsten, City of San Diego Public Utilities
Burton Loisa, San Diego County Water Authority
Caldwell, Kathy, RMC Water and Environment
Campos, Jaime, City of El Cajon
Carnegie, John, Olivenhain Municipal Water District
Carpenter, Laura, Brown & Caldwell
Chunn-Heer, Julia, Surfrider San Diego
Craig, Kelly, Zoological Society of San Diego
Dale, Cari, City of Oceanside
Davies, Dennis, City of El Cajon
Drennan, Michael, Weston Solutions
Duffy, Jennifer, Atkins
Filter, Gale, Coastkeeper
Flannery, Kathleen, County of San Diego
Fogec, Peter, City of San Diego Public Utilities
Gaines, Stephanie, County of San Diego

Gibson, David, San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board
Goehring, Lisa, City of San Diego
Harris, Bill, City of San Diego
Harvey, David, Rural Communities Assistance Corporation
Hastings, Mike, Los Peñasquitos Lagoon Foundation
Hudnall, Sharon, Jacobs Center for Neighborhood Innovation
Hunter, Bill, Santa Fe Irrigation District
Jungreis, Jeremy, USMC Camp Pendleton
Jurkevics, Lauma, California Dept of Water Resources
Karafin, Sean, San Diego County Taxpayers Association
Kelley, Gage, San Diego County Water Authority
Krzys, Greg, US Bureau of Reclamation
Lahsaie, Mo, City of Oceanside
Larson, Eric, San Diego County Farm Bureau
Lowe, Cary
Martin, Peter, City of San Diego
McPherson, Sheri, County of San Diego
Michaelson, Lewis, Katz and Associates
Mohr, Crystal, RMC Water and Environment
Mosher, Ron, Sweetwater Authority
Najera, Crystal, City of Encinitas
O'Donnell, Bill, San Dieguito Water District
Pasek, Jeff, City of San Diego
Patton, Gail, San Diego County Water Authority
Pech, Eddie, California Dept of Water Resources
Plyler, Steve, City of Carlsbad
Purohit, Joe, EcoLayers, Inc.
Randall, Joey, Olivenhain Municipal Water District
Raver, Deena, County of San Diego
Robinson, Scott, San Diego County Water Authority
Roy, Toby, San Diego County Water Authority
Ryan, Erica, City of San Marcos
Sands, Julie, City of San Diego
Sandvik, Arne, Padre Dam Municipal Water District
Skutecki, Lisa, Industrial Environmental Association
Simes, Jack, US Bureau of Reclamation
Smith, Don, Vista Irrigation District
Smith, Jennifer, Sweetwater Authority
Snyder, Todd, County of San Diego
Soriano, Marisa, City of Chula Vista
Spivy-Weber, Fran, State Water Resources Control Board Member
Stadler, Mark, San Diego County Water Authority
Steenblock, Erik, City of Encinitas

Steirer, Marsi, City of San Diego
Sterchi, Sean, California Department of Public Health
Tedford, Claudia, City Place Planning
Tellefsen, Kurt, Tellefsen and Associates
Tennyson, Patsy, Katz and Associates
Thach, Goldy, City of San Diego
Watson, Alyson, RMC Water and Environment
Weinberg, Ken, San Diego County Water Authority
Welch, Michael, Michael R. Welch Consulting
Wells, David, City of San Diego
Williamson, Rich, Rancho California Water District
Wonsidler, Michael, County of San Diego
Yano, Roberto, City of Chula Vista
Yun, Joe, California Dept of Water Resources

Welcome

Ms. Marsi Steirer of the City of San Diego provided general introductions, and introduced Mayor Jerry Sanders to Summit attendees. Mayor Sanders provided the official welcome to Summit attendees. He noted that water management is a very important issue, particularly in San Diego, and that integration (such as that provided by Integrated Regional Water Management [IRWM] efforts) are important, as collaboration is critical to moving the region toward sustainable water management. Mayor Sanders noted that San Diego has been very successful in water management to-date, particularly considering the region has grown by approximately 300,000 people since 1989, yet uses less water now than we did in 1989. In addition, Mayor Sanders noted that innovative projects such as the City’s Water Purification Demonstration Project provide exciting future opportunities. In closing, Mayor Sanders thanked the group for their participation and noted his excitement about future IRWM planning efforts.

Keynote Speaker

Ms. Fran Spivy-Weber of the State Water Resources Control Board provided an overview of the IRWM program, which included the history of IRWM planning in California. Ms. Spivy-Weber noted that IRWM planning was initially borne out of multiple examples that demonstrated that planning in individual water management “silos” can be very detrimental to overall project success. IRWM planning provides a method for moving forward from the traditional “silo” approach to water resources planning, encouraging integration across jurisdictions and topical areas.

Local Vision

Ms. Kathleen Flannery of the County of San Diego and the Chair of the Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) gave a presentation to the group on the local vision of the San Diego IRWM region (Region). Ms. Flannery noted that in general, as stated by Ms. Spivy-Weber, IRWM planning was established as a means to overcome barriers and move on beyond traditional water planning. Ms. Flannery noted that in contrast to regions such as Santa Ana

where the IRWM region consists of one watershed, the San Diego Region consists of eleven watersheds that have a wide variety of issues. The complexity of the Region has led to many complicated issues and challenges that the Region continues to address in an attempt to answer the overarching question: What does success (related to water resources planning) look like? The Region is moving forward in answering this question with development of the IRWM Plan Update, which will update the existing (2007) IRWM Plan, and move the Region further along the path to “sustainable water management.” Currently, the Region defines sustainable water management as follows: “Sustainable water management meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own water supply, water quality, and natural resource needs.”

Santa Margarita Case Study

Mr. Rich Williamson of the Rancho California Water District and Mr. Jeremy Jungreis of Camp Pendleton and the San Diego County Water Authority Board of Directors provided a presentation on the Santa Margarita River watershed. The Santa Margarita River is considered an excellent IRWM case study, because it crosses two IRWM regional boundaries, as well as multiple jurisdictional boundaries. In addition, there are many competing uses, water quality issues, and a long history of litigation over water rights within the Santa Margarita River watershed.

The issues faced by the Santa Margarita River watershed make it an ideal candidate for IRWM planning. To date, the Tri-County Funding Area Coordinating Committee (FACC) and other IRWM players have successfully worked together to secure funding for much-needed projects, move forward toward achieving regulatory compliance, and develop standards to protect beneficial uses. Although not all issues for the Santa Margarita River have been resolved, those involved generally agree that an integrated and collaborative problem-solving has been an efficient and effective means to achieve objectives.

State Perspectives Panel

Mr. Lewis Michaelson, facilitator for the Summit, introduced the panel and asked each panel member to provide a brief biography. Panelists included Dave Gibson, Executive Director of the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Board), Sean Sterchi of the California Department of Public Health, Joe Yun of the California Department of Water Resources (DWR), and Fran Spivy Weber of the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board).

Mr. Michaelson then introduces a set of questions, and asked each panelist to respond and discuss issues as they see fit.

Question 1: As you look across the state, what trends or innovations in integrated water management are you seeing that excite you? What are opportunities in the future for integrated water management?

Dave Gibson: I see the growing importance of implementing indirect potable reuse (IPR) as a very exciting trend. I see this as a future trend as being important across the entire state. Furthermore, I see integration of agricultural interests into planning for and addressing water quality issues as an important trend.

Sean Sterchi: I agree that IPR is an important and exciting trend. On this note, regulations for groundwater augmentation and surface water augmentation with advanced treated water are exciting trends. In addition, other new supply efforts such as desalination to increase local water supplies are important and exciting.

Joe Yun: For me it is exciting to see relationships that are built through integration, and what can be leveraged by these relationships. It is also exciting to see that IRWM planning has remained consistent and is in some ways becoming the norm for how planning is completed in California. Furthermore, it is exciting to see the kinds of projects that can come about through IRWM planning and moving beyond the traditional silo planning method.

Fran Spivy-Weber: I am excited and impressed by IRWM regions that are moving into a whole new world. For example, in the San Joaquin Valley, people are considering floating their own bond to pay for future IRWM efforts. Los Angeles is considering a parcel tax for stormwater that will be divided in an IRWM-like fashion with 40% to the cities, 10% to the County, and 50% to subregional projects.

Question 2: Is there anything else that your agency may promote or enhance to increase collaboration?

Dave Gibson: How we collect, store, and use data and information is key. It is often the case that we find ourselves missing data or not knowing what to do with data that we have. This is a priority for the Regional Board. Projects such as the California Environmental Data Exchange Network are important for collaborating and working together with available data.

Fran Spivy-Weber: We are interested in coordinating other planning efforts with IRWM planning efforts. For example, in Los Angeles we are interested in coordinating planning efforts for the Los Angeles River with the Los Angeles IRWM effort.

Question 3: Are there any changes you are already contemplating in how you do business or perform your role with respect to IRWM planning?

Dave Gibson: We have discussed sending a representative from the Regional Board to participate in the Regional Advisory Committee. In addition, the Regional Board is involved in the IRWM Plan Update by participating in a Workgroup that will discuss a future White Paper that explores the topic of collaboration with the Regional Board.

Joe Yun: From my end at DWR, I am interested in ensuring consistency with the IRWM Plan standards and making sure that expectations regarding the standards are clear. Furthermore, DWR is working on an IRWM Strategic Plan, which will be a companion document to the California Water Plan.

Fran Spivy-Weber: We are working on water legislation with the State Board and the Army Corps of Engineers to determine instream flows for the Bay Delta water bodies by 2014 and for all other major rivers and streams by 2018. The State Board is taking this effort very seriously. In addition, we are interested in getting people together to figure out how to achieve water rights allocations.

Sean Sterchi: We are working with local groups on groundwater augmentation regulations and are also working with the San Diego County Water Authority to change the recycled water oversight program.

Breakout Groups

Mr. Lewis Michaelson, facilitator for the Summit, asked participants to break into smaller groups to work through an exercise in which they would hold discussions regarding the following:

1. Identify the challenges to successful integrated water resources planning in the San Diego Region.
2. Consider the existing IRWM Program Objectives and discuss whether any should be added to the list.
3. Using a scale of 1-10 (10 being the highest score), rank the objectives in each of the following categories: social, environmental, and economic.

The compiled list of challenges determined by the breakout groups is provided below.

Breakout Group 1:

- Collaboration
- Inclusion of tribes/disadvantaged communities (DACs)
- Structure inhibits collaboration/management
- Need early planning to integrate/coordinate
- Coordination regarding recycled water
- Coordination between stormwater and flood agencies
- Harnessing resources to tackle time limits and big problems
- All resource agencies should be involved
- Developing relationships helps deal with issues
 - Non-source pollutants
 - Not as much about relationships
- Bringing land use planners into the process
- Economics of multi-benefit solutions
- Need to quantify goals
- Lack of funding – pressure from budget constraints
- Goals (flood vs. water quality) are in conflict
- Overcoming obstacles to use in grey water – need to state policy to enable local action

Breakout Group 2:

- Outreach to DACs
- Regulatory inflexibility
- Integration of water management “silos”
- Sheer number of entities
- Meaningful collaboration, common goal
- Finding shared interests (communicating)
- Institutional/jurisdictional inflexibility
- Finding balance with the triple bottom line
- Compromising is losing
- Maintaining long-term vision, not just money
- Understanding stakeholders and their goals

Breakout Group 3:

- Better coordination with agencies
- Permit do not work well with the Basin Plan
- Make sure all perspectives are represented
- Unadjudicated basins
- Adequate funding
- Knowledge within community
- Getting elected officials involved
- Coordination among all players
- Added emphasis on local supplies
- Fracturing of viewpoints
- Environmental impacts of projects
- Funding and other delays
- Flexibility in timing of funding and regulatory requirements
- Conflicts between agency goals
- Combining projects for multiple benefits
- Enforcement of regulations
- Public support for funding
- Inter-agency transfers
- Regional planning for facilities
- Involvement beyond water supply agencies

Breakout Group 4:

- Need collaboration to reduce redundancy and determine next steps
- Need coordination and high quality of data (useful data)
- One size does not fit all
- Time required for integration
- Political pressures
- Water supply as an issue
- Representation is difficult for large jurisdictions – maybe utilize a JPA
- Getting everybody to the table
- Economy – organizations cannot participate in everything
- Lack of coordination leads to duplicative efforts
- Grants – time horizons are very long. There needs to be a pot of money for smaller, short-term projects
- Issues with conflicting regulatory requirements
- Justification of regulatory intent. Regulations need to be vetted through partnerships
- Moving toward a watershed-based approach: challenge to smaller projects and issues with consistency
- Do not have governance structure for making decisions across jurisdictions
- Competing interests for water resources
- Environmental vs. utility needs
- Costs for integrating and being successful

- Grants – tend to go to large agencies and projects. Difficult for NGOs to compete due to complexity
- Grants do not pay for planning. Implementation is challenging and requires thoughtful planning

The proposed new IRWM objectives and modifications to the 2007 IRWM Objectives identified by each breakout group are listed below

Breakout Group 1:

- Need to prioritize a plan to consider climate change
- More ongoing education regarding water issues
- Position region to seek additional funding
- Protect health and safety (social)

Breakout Group 2:

- Modify Objective No. 1 to the following:
 - “Develop and maintain a diverse, reliable, cost-effective mix of water resources.”
- Modify Objective No. 2 to the following”
 - “Construct, operate, design, plan, and maintain a reliable infrastructure system.”
- Promote efficiency and conservation of water
- Promote public education of water issues

Breakout Group 3:

- Coordinate regulatory/planning framework across agencies to promote pragmatic compliance across the region
- Increase public awareness, education, and engagement to foster public support for IRWM

Breakout Group 4:

- Modify Objective No. 1 to the following:
 - “Develop and maintain a diverse mix of local water resources.”
- Modify Objective No. 2 to the following:
 - “Construct, operate, and maintain a reliable water-related infrastructure system.”
- Develop a governance structure to facilitate IRWM planning
- Develop better processes and means to prioritize benefits
- Expend resources for IRWM planning in the most efficient manner possible

Report Back

Each breakout group appointed a representative to discuss the results of the breakout group. A summary of each breakout group’s presentation is provided below.

Breakout Group 1:

The theme of our group was regarding challenges to collaborative planning efforts. In general, many people agreed that the existing structure inhibits collaboration. This is especially true with IRWM funding that does not encourage planning efforts – planning efforts are necessary to ensure integration. In total, we recommend adding four additional objectives: one relating to climate change, one relating to education, one relating to positioning the Region for additional funding, and one to add a social component (health and safety), which is missing from the current objectives.

Breakout Group 2:

We found that one of the largest challenges expressed is in communication. Communication challenges exist in both finding people to work with (aligning interests), and also in properly communicating shared interests. Furthermore, while the group expressed support for the long-term vision of the IRWM program, it is unclear how individual projects will get us there. Our group found that the existing objectives do need minor changes, but that in addition we recommend adding two additional objectives.

Breakout Group 3:

We found that, overall, better coordination is needed between agencies and groups; this is especially important to ensure that all perspectives are represented. Furthermore, we found that outreach is very important. Many individuals expressed lack of knowledge of the public, which makes future actions difficult. It is difficult to address problems if people are not aware that they exist. Our group decided to add two additional objectives that would address the aforementioned issues.

Breakout Group 4:

We found that there was a large discussion of challenges, and that most people were in agreement on the challenges. First, many people agreed that the current economy presents challenges to collaboration as many agencies and groups are unable to attend meetings due to time and monetary constraints. Second, we found that there are many issues regarding data – particularly the need for quality data that is accessible. Third, we found that there are many issues associated with IRWM grants – the grants do not include funding for planning, which is necessary to have competitive implementation projects. Grants also favor large multi-year projects, and there is a general lack of funding available for smaller short-term projects that are better suited to NGOs and small agencies. In sum, we found that the first two objectives should be slightly modified, and that we would add three objectives: one related to governance, one related to prioritization, and one related to efficiency.

Closing

Mr. Lewis Michaelson, facilitator for the Summit, thanked everyone for attending, noting that there are many future opportunities for participation. He encouraged attendees to stay informed via the SDIRWM website, and by attending Regional Advisory Committee meetings.