



**San Juan- Santa Margarita- San Luis Rey
Workshop on 2013 San Diego IRWM Plan, Watersheds, and
Disadvantaged Communities**

Workshop Notes

Thursday July 11, 2013
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Oceanside Civic Center
330 North Coast Highway
Oceanside, CA 92054

Attendance

Crystal Mohr, RMC Water & Environment
Denise Landstedt, Rancho California Water District and USMW IRWM Region
George Wilkins, La Jolla Band of Luiseno Indians
Goldy Thach, City of San Diego
Harris Schurmeier, Utility Commission City of Oceanside
Heidi Brow, Pala Band of Mission Indians
Howard Pippen, Resident
Jimmy Knott, Utility Commission City of Oceanside
Karla Stendridge, Mission Resource Conservation District
Loretta Bates, UC Cooperative Extension
Mark Stadler, San Diego County Water Authority
Mary Clarke, Sierra Club
Mo Lahsaie, City of Oceanside
Pat Raetz, Utility Commission City of Oceanside
Paul Hartman, Larry Walker Associates
Pete Vrettas, SDSU Graduate Student
Roselyn Prickett, RMC Water & Environment
Roxy Carter, California Trout
Scott Norris, County of San Diego
Sue Pender, RBF Consulting
Teresa Penunuri, San Diego County Water Authority
Toby Roy, San Diego County Water Authority
Wayne Daigle, Utility Commission City of Oceanside

Welcome and Introductions

Teresa Penunuri, San Diego County Water Authority (facilitator), welcomed everyone to the meeting. Introductions were made around the room. Ms. Penunuri discussed the purpose of the workshop, which was to: present and discuss contents of the draft 2013 San Diego IRWM Plan, review draft

watershed characterizations for San Juan, Santa Margarita, and San Luis Rey watersheds, and discuss disadvantaged community issues within the watersheds.

IRWM Overview

Goldy Thach, City of San Diego, provided the group with an overview of the 2013 IRWM Plan. To begin the overview, Ms. Thach described IRWM planning and the statewide IRWM Program. Ms. Thach described IRWM planning as an innovative way to increase reliable water supplies, improve water quality, and protect natural resources through cooperation among public agencies with different jurisdictions and non-profit public interest organizations. Ms. Thach also explained that IRWM planning is the State's preferred method of funding local water management, and that the IRWM Program is used to disburse water bond funding from Proposition 50, 84, and 1E.

Ms. Thach described the San Diego IRWM Program, which is led by the Regional Water Management Group (RWMG) consisting of the San Diego County Water Authority, City of San Diego, and County of San Diego. The primary advisory to the RWMG is the Regional Advisory Committee or RAC. RAC members represent water supply, wastewater, stormwater, natural resources and include other community members representing tribes, academia, Chamber of Commerce, the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), and agriculture. In addition, we have had representation from State and Federal agencies such as Regional Water Quality Control Board staff and the U. S. Bureau of Reclamation.

The San Diego IRWM Region is comprised of 11 parallel hydrologic units that flow west from the mountains into the Pacific Ocean. Eight of the watersheds are within San Diego County and three are partially located in another county or Mexico.

IRWM planning has two primary functions: grant project funding and project planning. The benefits of IRWM planning are that it coordinates and integrates water management activities within a region, emphasizes local priority setting and control, establishes regional goals and targets, identifies and helps to fund projects to achieve goals, and fosters cooperation among agencies and non-governmental organizations.

2013 IRWM Plan

Goldy Thach then provided information about the 2013 IRWM Plan, which was updated based upon the 2007 IRWM Plan but with the addition of new planning documents and reports, planning studies, and stakeholder input. The 2013 IRWM Plan was also updated to meet new IRWM Plan requirements established by the Department of Water Resources (DWR).

With respect to the DWR requirements, the 2013 IRWM Plan includes new sections on integrated flood management and climate change, but was also tailored to reflect the Region's unique circumstances. For example, the 2013 IRWM Plan includes a separate chapter on watershed descriptions to reflect the Region's unique hydrologic structure (11 parallel watershed), and also includes a separate chapter on tribal nations to describe the Region's diverse tribal nations. Ms. Thach then provided an overview of each of the eleven 2013 IRWM Plan Chapters:

Chapter 1, Introduction:

This chapter includes the purpose and organization of the 2013 IRWM Plan purpose and organization, the governance structure (RWMG) and IRWM Program structure, describes how the

2013 IRWM Plan is consistent with IRWM Plan Guidelines (DWR requirements), and includes an overview of challenges and conflicts in water management and how IRWM planning can help address them.

Chapter 2, Vision and Objectives:

This chapter includes the IRWM Vision, Mission, Goals, and Objectives. The IRWM Vision is: an integrated, balanced, and consensus-based approach to ensuring the long-term sustainability of the Region's water supply, water quality, and natural resources.

The 2013 IRWM Plan has eleven objectives, which were updated with extensive input from stakeholders. The 2013 IRWM Plan also includes new pass/fail rules for projects: 1) To be included in the San Diego IRWM Plan, all implementation projects must contribute to at least one IRWM Plan objective, 2) To be considered for IRWM funding, implementation projects must contribute to the attainment of Objective A, Objective B, and at least one other objective. The IRWM objectives are:

- A. Encourage the development of integrated solutions to address water management issues and conflicts
- B. Maximize stakeholder/community involvement and stewardship of water resources, emphasizing education and outreach
- C. Effectively obtain, manage, and assess water resource data and information
- D. Further the scientific and technical foundation of water management
- E. Develop and maintain a diverse mix of water resources, encouraging their efficient use and development of local water supplies
- F. Construct, operate, and maintain a reliable infrastructure system
- G. Enhance natural hydrologic processes to reduce the effects of hydromodification and encourage integrated flood management
- H. Effectively reduce sources of pollutants and environmental stressors to protect and enhance human health, safety, and the environment
- I. Protect, restore, and maintain habitat and open space
- J. Optimize water-based recreational opportunities
- K. Effectively address climate change through adaptation or mitigation in water resource management

Chapter 3, Region Description:

This chapter was comprehensively updated with: new information available since 2007, planning studies conducted specifically for the IRWM Program, and input from the RAC and other stakeholders. This chapter includes a summary of regional water resources with tables that are generally organized by watershed. This chapter also includes three new sections: Stormwater Management, Flood Management, and Climate Change.

Chapter 4, Tribal Nations:

This chapter is an entirely new chapter that was created based on data review and outreach to tribal nations. Information in this chapter was vetted extensively by tribal representatives, and includes a description of tribal reservations and groups and an overview of water management issues on tribal lands.

Chapter 5, Watershed Characterizations:

This chapter is an entirely new chapter that was created based on data review and outreach through Watershed Workshops conducted in September 2012. Each watershed description contains information on hydrology, water systems, land uses, stormwater and flood, natural resources, and management issues and conflicts.

Chapter 6, Governance & Stakeholder Involvement:

This chapter describes the overall governance structure of the IRWM Program and stakeholder involvement that has taken place to-date. This chapter was updated based on extensive outreach conducted since 2007, including input from a specific ad-hoc workgroup that was convened to discuss governance and financing of the IRWM Program (Governance and Financing Workgroup). Although the workgroup did not recommend making changes to the overall governance structure, the workgroup drafted a formal charter for the RAC, which is included in this chapter.

Chapter 7, Regional Coordination:

This chapter includes information about coordination of information and planning studies across the IRWM Region. This chapter also includes a high-level summary of the planning studies that were conducted for the 2013 IRWM Plan. Those studies, which include *Collaboration with Regional Board, Salinity Nutrient Management Planning Guidelines, Integrated Flood Management, Climate Change Analysis, Water Management and Land Use* are appended to Chapter 7 of the 2013 IRWM Plan.

Chapter 8, Resource Management:

This chapter was updated based on the Resource Management Strategies (RMS) in the *2009 California Water Plan Update*. This chapter includes all of the RMS that were deemed, through stakeholder input, to be applicable to the IRWM Region. This chapter also includes additional RMS that were identified by stakeholders, and includes examples of how the RMS are being implemented in the IRWM Region.

Chapter 9, Project Evaluation and Prioritization:

This chapter outlines the general process for selecting projects for future rounds of grant funding. Information in this chapter includes updates to project scoring that were made to better-sort projects based on their value to the Region and based on the principles of IRWM planning. This chapter was updated based on input from an ad-hoc workgroup that was convened for the 2013 IRWM Plan (the Priorities and Metrics Workgroup), the workgroup that was convened to evaluate and recommend projects to be funded for Round 2 of Proposition 84 Implementation Grant funding, and the RAC.

Chapter 10, Data & Technical Analysis:

This chapter summarizes technical resources that are available in the Region for water-based planning purposes. This chapter acknowledges a future comprehensive Data Management System (DMS) that is being developed by the County, and includes a new “WaterGIS” database that is available on www.sdirwmp.org website.

Chapter 11, Implementation:

This chapter includes a series of “action items” that were developed based on the planning study recommendations (described in Chapter 7), and have received implementation commitments from a stakeholder in the Region. This chapter also includes information about updating and revising the IRWM Plan, including production of a Report Card every three years. Further, this chapter includes a comprehensive table of potential financing options for the IRWM Program and for IRWM projects.

Questions/Comments

- Can we have a copy of presentation?
 - *The presentation will be posted on the IRWM website (www.sdirwmp.org)*
- Chapter 3 mentions goals of the Regional Board, but I cannot find this document.
 - *The Regional Board has not yet finalized their “Practical Vision” document, but allowed us to see an early draft for discussion in the IRWM Plan.*
- We would like a chance to review the Regional Board’s Practical Vision document – there are concerns that this will not align with our goals (City of Oceanside), in which case we would be concerned about its inclusion in the IRWM Plan.
- Would like to see information about water rates – there is no mention of rates or a mention of a sliding scale or fixed scale for low-income folks.
- Would also like to see more open disclosure of Water Authority costs. Similar to the concerns regarding the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, we need open disclosure for costs and rates at the regional level.
- Would like to see further information on the Gregory Canyon Landfill.
- Appreciate the re-write of the Tribal Chapter (Chapter 4). It is much better!
- The San Luis Rey Watershed Council also has comprehensive goals and priorities, as do many individual groups in the Region. Are all of these groups’ visions included along with the Regional Board’s Vision?
 - *We have attempted to include information from the Region’s diverse stakeholder groups, but specifically included the Regional Board’s vision as it would potentially impact the entire Region.*
- The level of communication and openness has been impressive during the IRWM Plan development. Would like to see the communication remain open moving forward.
- Is information about the Regional Board’s new stormwater permit in the IRWM Plan?
 - *Yes, briefly. The permit was being developed while we were developing the IRWM Plan. This discussion will be updated in the final version of the IRWM Plan.*
- How does integration work in the cross-jurisdictional watersheds such as Santa Margarita and Tijuana?
 - *For the Santa Margarita and San Juan watersheds, we have coordination agreements with the neighboring IRWM regions that cover those watersheds. We work together as*

a group to share funding and to develop interregional projects.

- *Coordination across the border (with Mexico) for the Tijuana Watershed is more challenging. We hope to fund more projects and improve coordination in this watershed in the future.*

Watershed Characterizations

Ms. Rosalyn Prickett, RMC Water and Environment, provided an overview of the current characterizations for the San Luis Rey, San Juan, and Santa Margarita watersheds. Information on these watersheds, as provided by Ms. Prickett, is included below:

San Juan Watershed:

- 30% of watershed is in the San Diego IRWM Region (mostly not in the Region)
- Watershed has small, parallel creek systems that discharge to ocean and are generally intermittent
- The major water body in this watershed is San Mateo Creek
- Water systems in this watershed are primarily operated by the United States Marine Corps (USMC) Camp Pendleton (in the San Diego IRWM Region)
- There are two groundwater basins in the watershed: San Mateo and San Onofre Valley
- Land uses in the watershed include military base operations, open space, agriculture, limited residential
- There are water quality impairments (303(d) listings) at Pacific Ocean shoreline at San Mateo Creek for total coliform
- Surface water is high in total dissolved solids
- Elevated constituents in groundwater wells, but no long-term trends
- Stormwater and flood management are provided by the County of San Diego and USMC
- The watershed is largely undeveloped, and therefore supports various wildlife species, habitats, and special status species
- Undeveloped low-lying creeks and streambeds serve as wildlife corridors
- The watershed has unique challenges because of location in three different counties (jurisdictional issues)
- High military presence in this watershed can also impart management challenges and conflicts

Santa Margarita Watershed:

- 27% of watershed is within the San Diego IRWM Region. We generally refer to the portion within the County of San Diego as the “lower” watershed
- Santa Margarita River is the primary watercourse. This river has been reported as the longest free flowing, undammed river along the Southern California coastline
- Oceanside Harbor exists along the Pacific Ocean, but is not hydrologically connected to the Santa Margarita River
- River mouth fluctuates between open to tidal flushing and closed due to lack of flow
- Imported water supply served by the San Diego County Water Authority’s member agencies

- Groundwater is sourced from the Santa Margarita Valley Groundwater Basin
- Surface water is used directly and diverted to recharge groundwater
- Desalination and indirect potable reuse will provide future water supply sources
- The watershed has a long history of water rights conflicts
- Lower watershed includes County, Camp Pendleton, and small portion of City of Oceanside
- Upper watershed includes County, Cleveland National Forest, Pauma Reservation, and BLM lands
- Land uses are open space, military, rural residential, and agriculture
- Several water bodies are listed for 303(d) impairments; the Rainbow Creek Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) addresses nutrients
- Rapid population growth expected in upper watershed may cause additional surface water quality issues in future
- USMC Camp Pendleton has specific water quality concerns pertaining to groundwater quality – elevated manganese, which is naturally occurring
- Stormwater and flood management are provided by the County of San Diego and USMC
- Flooding on Santa Margarita River has damaged infrastructure on Camp Pendleton
- Channelization and other flood management upstream can lead to increased sedimentation and debris downstream following a storm
- Due to undeveloped nature, watershed contains abundance of habitat and wildlife, including steelhead trout, arroyo toad, tidewater goby, and song birds
- Unique challenges due to cross jurisdictional management, as well as ongoing water quality and water rights litigation within the watershed

San Luis Rey Watershed:

- Largest watershed completely within the San Diego IRWM Region
- San Luis Rey River has headwaters in Palomar Mountains and drains through City of Oceanside to the Pacific Ocean
- Lake Henshaw (Vista Irrigation District) is the largest reservoir in this watershed, and it stores surface water. This reservoir has a capacity of over 51,700 acre-feet (AF)
- Turner (Valley Center Municipal Water District) stores surface water, and Red Mountain (Fallbrook Public Utilities District), Morro Hill (Rainbow Municipal Water District) and Beck Reservoir (Rainbow Municipal Water District) all store imported water
- Escondido Canal conveys flows from Lake Henshaw to City of Escondido via Lake Wholford
- Imported water supply served by the San Diego County Water Authority's member agencies
- Groundwater sourced from San Luis Rey Valley, Warner Valley, and Ranchita Town Area
- Major recharge areas include the San Luis Rey River and tributary streambeds
- City of Oceanside pumps groundwater at Mission Basin Groundwater Purification Facility
- Watershed lies almost entirely within San Diego County; 0.2% in Riverside County
- West of I-5 has multiple uses: open space/undeveloped, residential, commercial/industrial and agricultural

- Land use agencies include small portions of Oceanside, Vista, Escondido, and USMC; also includes Cleveland National Forest lands and 5 tribal reservations: Pala, Pauma/Yuima, Rincon, La Jolla, and San Pasqual
- Several water bodies on 303(d) list for eutrophication, chloride, TDS, fecal coliform, nutrients, toxicity
- Stormwater and flood management are provided by the County of San Diego
- Much of river is unchannelized, but levees constructed in Oceanside for flood control purposes
- Stream gage data shows significant reduction in flood flows since construction of Henshaw Dam
- Flooding and mudslides have occurred during rain following wildfires
- Due to undeveloped nature, watershed contains abundance of habitat and wildlife, including defined freshwater fish communities
- Contains numerous protected and special-status species
- Surface water and shallow aquifer issues – historical pumping reduced groundwater levels and led to seawater intrusion; then addition of imported supply allowed groundwater to recover; but salinity issues remain
- San Luis Rey Watershed Council issues: water quality and quantity, heavy industrial and extractive uses, and invasive species

Questions/Comments

- For the San Luis Rey Watershed – the first 12 miles of the river have been actively managed by the United States Army Corps of Engineers since about 2001/2002. Given the City of Oceanside’s dependence on this water (from the San Luis Rey River) and the quality of this water, active management in the river needs to be addressed.
- Issue regarding the Santa Margarita River going through Camp Pendleton – it is really difficult to work on projects on the river because of jurisdictional issues. How are you doing this?
 - *The IRWM Program does not contract directly with the military on any projects – the contracts are with partnering agencies such as the County of San Diego and the Fallbrook Public Utilities District. Those agencies then contract with the military for work on the Santa Margarita River.*
- Regarding San Luis Rey: there are some issues with the characterization regarding year-round flows. Most years there is no flow at Pauma because of diversion structures west of Valley Center. The report of the “average flow” is therefore inaccurate; basically the water is completely diverted except during floods. Without diversions (not just Henshaw) there would be flows.
- Characterization of 5-party litigation is okay.
- Have heard of historic Pauma Falls – is it true that they existed? There are still flows in Pauma Creek, but not many. In general these flows never make it to the river due to groundwater infiltration.

- Restoration of steelhead research is mentioned from US Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. This is being brought forward to implementation, should be included.
- In the North County Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP), the San Luis Rey is one of the main focal points: is this included?
 - *Yes, it is. We will make sure that this is highlighted in the text.*
- Tribal Nations Chapter mentions that MSCPs are a concern to tribal nations, because the MSCP often views undeveloped tribal lands as open space for conservation, and may not consider tribal development plans. While this is in the tribal chapter, it is not in the watersheds chapter.
 - *Will include in Watersheds Chapter (Chapter 5) as well.*
- Will IRWM address Salt and Nutrient Management Plan (SNMP) requirements?
 - *Yes, the IRWM Program has been involved with the SNMP process. Have partially funded the development of six SNMPS in the Region. Have also helped to develop guidelines for developing SNMPS.*
- Who is responsible for developing SNMPS?
 - *Recycled water purveyors – the SNMP requirements are in the Recycled Water Policy.*
- In addition to the mention of damming and diversions, please include information about sand blockage and the need for sand replenishment.
- San Luis Rey River flood control is complicated and should be elaborated upon. Suggest adding information about the conflicts between the Army Corps of Engineers and the City of Oceanside, which have led to increased riparian habitat in the flood control channel. This causes issues as the riparian habitat cannot be removed, but also presents flood control issues.
- Desalination system includes recycled water and recharge system that involves Oceanside, Fallbrook, and Carlsbad.
- Is the San Luis Rey Watershed Council included as a stakeholder group?
 - *Yes, it is.*
- Is it indicated that part of the City of Oceanside lies in the Carlsbad Watershed?
 - *Yes, this is mentioned as well. If you are able, please attend the additional workshop on July 17th that will discuss the Carlsbad Watershed.*
- You mentioned conjunctive use between Pendleton and Fallbrook Public Utilities District, but the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation is also included in this effort.
 - *Yes, this is mentioned in the document.*
- When describing the channelized flood control facilities, can you please mention their limitations? In 1916, there was a flood that wiped out a large part of Oceanside – this flood had a flow rate of about 96,000 cubic-feet per second (cfs). This kind of flood could still cause substantial damage, because the flood control channel is only rated to handle a flow of 87,000 cfs.

- Santa Margarita River Watershed: With regards to the mention of steelhead and its special status, there is a lot of concern about this designation and the ongoing Santa Margarita River Nutrient Project.
- Santa Margarita River Watershed: Issues between Rancho California Water District and Pendleton are not fully discussed; Rancho California Water District will provide comments.
- Santa Margarita River Watershed: The water quality section mentions that the upper watershed (in Riverside County) contributes water quality issues to the lower watershed. Would like to better explain this relationship.
- Santa Margarita River Watershed: The information about the SNMP needs to be modified – this is characterized as across the watershed, when it is really just for the Temecula Groundwater Basin and other specific groundwater basins. Please describe all of the SNMP efforts in the watershed.
- Santa Margarita River Watershed: The information about the Santa Margarita River project presents information about the watershed – the funding was not for the watershed, but for the river. Please revise.

Disadvantaged Community Issues in Watershed

Mark Stadler, San Diego County Water Authority provided information about disadvantaged community (DAC) issues. Mr. Stadler explained that according to DWR, DACs are defined as geographic areas with a combined Median Household Income (MHI) of less than 80% of the Statewide MHI (\$48,706 in 2010). To-date, the IRWM Program has gathered information about DAC issues pertaining to water management. The program has found that urban and rural DAC issues are distinct, and are generalized as follows:

- Urban DACs
 - Poor surface water quality, including San Diego Bay
 - Flooding due to creek constrictions
 - Public perception – education and outreach
- Rural DACs
 - Unreliable water supply
 - Contamination of drinking water supply
 - Deteriorating infrastructure – water and septic
 - Technical/Managerial/Financial capacity

Mr. Stadler then invited the group to provide additional comments about DAC issues either within the Region or pertaining to DACs in particular watersheds. Mr. Stadler noted that any additional comments pertaining to the IRWM Plan or watershed characterizations were also welcome at this time. Below is an overview of additional input received:

Question/comments

- Add information about water rates and sliding scales.
- Add information about poor civic planning that impacts DACs. This includes increasing high-density and low-income housing near flood-prone areas. This is true of the area surrounding

Loma Alta Creek. This is also true of public transit, as the Sprinter line is located within the floodplain.

- Should consider discussing rehabilitation, including rehabilitating high-density land uses in the floodplain into open space for flood control purposes.
- With regards to flooding, there is a lot of concern as flooding as it pertains to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The Natural Hydrologic Warning Council is particularly concerned with how FEMA removes areas from a designated floodplain once flood control facilities have been installed. This is an issue, because it allows development to occur in areas that are still prone to flooding.
- Concern with some areas that are not characterized as DACs. For example, in Pauma Valley there are a few areas with high income, but the area is predominately low income.
 - *We recognize this, and are working with RCAC to complete additional surveys in some of the rural areas that are not currently mapped as DACs.*
- In the rural areas, there are issues with household hazardous waste since the County got rid of their program for transfer stations.
- In the rural areas there is not enough money for wastewater treatment and disposal
- There is a general issue concerning tribes and DWR – tribes, especially tribal DACs would like to participate in the IRWM Program, but are concerned with DWR's CEQA requirement.
- In Oceanside there are several mobile home parks, which do not appear to be on the DAC map. There are also several senior communities that are likely not on the map.
- In Oceanside, there are more issues with young homeless populations.
- In the San Luis Rey Watershed, there are several mobile home parks within the floodplain.
- Is it possible to expand the definition of a DAC beyond the DWR definition? Could we use something such as the percentage of low-income people in a certain area?
 - *We can try to do this, but it is risky as DWR may not accept this definition.*
- There is an issue with TDS in the drinking water. It seems like this should be treated further to remove TDS – with reverse osmosis systems.
- Look at the EPA Financial Hardship definition – this may give some additional information. It is from the Integrated Planning and Permit Process.

Summary and Thanks

Teresa Penunuri thanked everyone for attending, and noted to please submit comments by July 31st:

Email: Rosalyn Prickett: sdirwmp@mcwater.com

Web Forum: <http://sdirwmp.org>

Hard Copy: Mark Stadler, IRWM Program Manager
4677 Overland Avenue, San Diego, CA 92123

Ms. Penunuri also invited stakeholders to attend the August 7th RAC meeting, which will be held from 9 a.m. – 11:30 a.m. at the San Diego County Water Authority (address above).