



**Regional Advisory Council
Meeting #11 Notes**

September 5, 2007, 9:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
San Diego County Water Authority
4677 Overland Avenue, San Diego, CA 92123

Attendance – RAC Members

Craig Adams, San Dieguito River Valley Conservancy
Kirk Ammerman, City of Chula Vista
Meleah Ashford, Consultant to the City of Encinitas
Chris Basilevac, The Nature Conservancy
Dennis Bostad, Sweetwater Authority
Michael Connolly, Campo Kumeyaay Nation
Kathleen Flannery, County of San Diego
Karen Franz, San Diego Coastkeeper
Megan Johnson, Southern California Wetlands Recovery Project
Greg Kryzs, on behalf of Meena Westford, United States Bureau of Reclamation
Keith Lewinger, Fallbrook Public Utility District
Judy Mitchell, Mission Resource Conservation District
Marsi Steirer, City of San Diego
Mike Thornton, San Elijo Joint Powers Authority
Ken Weinberg, San Diego County Water Authority
Mark Weston, Helix Water District
Richard Wright, Department of Geography, San Diego State University
Susan Varty, Olivenhain Municipal Water District

Attendance – RWMG Staff

Dana Frieauf, San Diego County Water Authority
Sheri McPherson, County of San Diego
Jeff Pasek, City of San Diego
Mark Stadler, San Diego County Water Authority
Jon Van Rhyn, County of San Diego

Attendance – Interested Parties to the RAC

Brett Kawakami, RMC Water and Environment
Alyson Watson, RMC Water and Environment
Michael Welch, Michael R. Welch Consulting

Attendance – Public

Kelly Craig, San Diego Zoo
Diana Hussey, Resource Conservation District

Introductions

Ms. Kathleen Flannery (Chairperson) welcomed Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) members to their 11th meeting. Brief introductions were made by all RAC members, consultants, and other members of the general public in attendance.

Proposed Modifications to Draft IRWM Plan

Ms. Alyson Watson (RMC Water and Environment) indicated that a matrix of the proposed responses to comments was sent out to the RAC for review via email in August. That matrix included comments on the projects as well as comments on the Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan itself. At the August 1 RAC meeting, the comments on the projects were discussed and the results of the prioritization process were presented. Today, examples of the comments received on the IRWM Plan will be reviewed and proposed responses will be presented, with the purpose of gathering feedback from RAC on the proposed approach to responding to the public comments on the IRWM Plan.

Ms. Dana Frieauf reviewed the public comments on the IRWM Plan. 183 comments were received and the Regional Water Management Group (RWMG) is seeking feedback on the proposed responses that were emailed to the RAC in advance of the meeting. RAC input on addressing the comments is critical, as the RWMG will ask the RAC to recommend that the RWMG governing bodies adopt the San Diego Integrated Water Management Plan (Plan) at the September 19 RAC meeting.

RAC Member Comments and Responses:

- Why isn't the Plan more forthcoming about relationship between the City of San Diego and SDCWA. *This is described in Section B.*
- The proposed revision for mentioning a watershed based approach takes us nowhere – there is no indication of action or testing or how this carries over to targets. There is no commitment to do anything. *This will be addressed in the upcoming discussion on institutional structure.*
- Structure and action are tied together. We have been putting it off. I would like to see a commitment that we will test watershed based approaches. *The San Diego IRWMP does not exclude watershed planning. Please refer to the action plan in Section G.3 of the Plan. Workgroups will be formed to review local water management plans, including watershed plans.*
- While the process does not exclude watershed planning, it does nothing to promote it. *The Plan recognizes that there is a gap in watershed plans and that there is a need for additional planning. At the October 9 RAC meeting, we will discuss how to achieve this in the context of institutional structure.*
- Do projects score higher if they show continuity in a watershed? *The projects scored higher if they were cited in an existing Plan or had linkages to other projects in the Region, but there was no provision for additional score if a project is tied together with other projects specifically within a watershed. However, this is something that the Workgroup is considering as it prepares the proposed funding application package.*

Conclusions/Actions

None

Measurable Targets

Mr. John Van Rhyn discussed the proposed measurable targets.

Objective C: Mr. Van Rhyn discussed proposed changes to Targets #1 and #2. Mr. Van Rhyn indicated that the rationale for the proposed change was to avoid replicating what the Regional Board is doing (i.e. Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program [SWAMP] etc). There are approximately 126 water bodies in the region and the target involves determining if a water quality assessment has been conducted for each of these. "Assessment" is not well defined, so the RWMG is looking for some level of assessment (e.g., 303(d)-related monitoring, SWAMP and others). Out of 126 drainages, 41 are impaired and thus some level of assessment has occurred to get them on the list. Between the 303(d) listings and SWAMP monitoring data, it was found that at least 58 out of 126 water bodies have been sampled (46%). There is still an unknown amount of sampling being conducted. Groundwater was removed from the target at this time because groundwater and surface water quality issues are very different and are not easily combined. Mr. Van Rhyn said that Target #2 was modified to make it more flexible.

Objective E: Mr. Van Rhyn discussed proposed changes to Target #2.

Objective F: Mr. Van Rhyn discussed proposed changes to Target #3. For Target #3, there are currently no consistent methods to measure the extent of impervious surfaces Region-wide, so the establishment of a system to track changes in impervious surfaces is now the proposed target.

Objective G: Mr. Van Rhyn discussed proposed changes to Target #5. Target #5 was modified to include impacts to surface water because there are some sanitary sewer overflows (SSOs) that do not cause significant impacts to surface water and are therefore not relevant to this target.

Objective H: Mr. Van Rhyn discussed proposed changes to Targets #1, #2, #3, #4 and #5. Target #3 was rolled into Targets #1 and #2 and Target #4 was eliminated. "Acquire" in Targets #1 and #2 was replaced with "Conserve" to be consistent with Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) language and to be precise in the action to be taken. The focus of Target #1 is now on conserving open space and habitat, while the focus of Target #2 is on restoring open space and habitat. The conservation target was set at approximately 5% of the land listed in the San Diego MSCP Plan for acquisition. The target for restoration was set equal to 10% of the value for conservation.

RAC Member Comments and Responses:

Objective C

- Does Target #1 include the ocean? *No.*
- Does Target #1 say we are going to do water quality assessments? *No, there are already two regulatory processes that are generating data for assessment.*
- The Clean Water Act (which drives water quality assessment) does not cover source water protection, but source water protection is very significant to water management and supply. *Agreed, we want to identify all relevant sources of data, especially that which is more difficult to obtain.*
- Groundwater and seawater should be included. To exclude them because it is too complicated is not prudent (RAC indicated consensus). *We can include them, but without a specific target. Also, groundwater and surface water will be kept separate due to the different challenges associated with each.*

- How do we get from 50% to 75% assessment? Will member agencies go through the lists and identify which drainages have not been assessed? *There is no specific plan right now. The responsible agencies will need to be identified as part of the institutional structure discussion. Then, a the preferred approach to working toward the target can be identified.*
- Write the target as $\frac{3}{4}$ rather than 75%, as it indicates that the target is not a hard number. *The change will be made.*
- What units would be measured? *Hydrologic unit designations for discrete water bodies will be used as the unit of measurement.*
- Do you see reps from RAC interacting with Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Board)? *Yes.*
- There should be a reference that we will work with Regional Board, the current implication is that we will do this independently.
- In reading this, I would interpret that we would have a revised Basin Plan by 2018, I think we need to more aggressive. *We will coordinate with the Regional Board schedule and try to stay ahead. We have also added an interim objective, which is tracking progress of the Basin Plan.*

Objective E

- For Target #2, does this include Twin Oaks Water Treatment Plant? *Yes.*
- What is the reference year used as the starting point? *We looked at what was existing in 2002-2004 and considered expansion to 2030, so 2003 is the appropriate reference year.*
- The 2030 year target implies 2030 or sooner? *Yes.*
- The “expand by” date of 2030 should be checked, it is likely that this will be achieved by 2015. *We will check the date.*
- Is the goal to reduce water demand from MWD to zero? *The goal is to ensure that we have adequate treatment capacity.*
- Does Target #2 incorporate distribution infrastructure? *This is included as another target.*
- Shouldn't there be some basis in projects for meeting targets? *Yes, that is being considered by the Workgroup.*
- Include interim dates for Target #2. Also specify the starting point for reference.

Objective F

- I disagree that you can't measure impervious surfaces. It may not be easy, but it should be something that engineers, hydrologists can do. *We are trying to establish metrics. One problem is that we don't control local jurisdictions.*
- I would like to see language added to indicate that the reason for developing a system for monitoring is ultimately to slow the rate of increase in impervious surfaces throughout the region.
- Both Low Impact Development (LID) and redevelopment (i.e. conversion of impervious to pervious surfaces) should be considered.
- The principle behind impervious surface reduction is to reduce runoff, correct? Can the target be changed to say reduce runoff? *These are not necessarily the same. The extent of impervious surfaces is important.*
- Reducing impervious surfaces and reducing runoff are complementary. Reducing impervious surfaces may not be the ideal in all situations. For example, there may be

opportunities for detention. We need to take a holistic view. *Research has shown that the amount of impervious surface is one of the best indicators of watershed health.*

- We should indicate that we are trying to slow the rate of increase in impervious surfaces.
- I don't think it will be too difficult to develop the tracking system. 2012 is too far away. The important thing to include is the reduction in rate of growth of impervious surfaces. *We can have a more aggressive target – say 2010.*
- I suggest that the rate of change be measured against something else (e.g. population growth).

Objective G

- Examine historical trends to develop appropriate percent reductions.
- Is the reduction measured in terms of volume or number of spills? *It is the number of SSOs.*
- To develop metrics, make use of Sewer System Management Plans (SSMPs) that agencies must develop by November.
- Impacts to beneficial uses should be considered in whether an SSO affects surface water. *This may be difficult to do. The target is based on information that is readily available.*
- Measuring this target in terms of volume rather than number should be considered. Now, any volume of spill is considered an SSO.

Objective H

- Do the numbers for Targets #1 and #2 include the North County? *Yes, it is included. (Note: This was confirmed following the RAC meeting).*
- I am not sure if a specific number should be included in the target. Instead the targets should be changed to say that MSCP programs will be supported throughout the County.
- I disagree. Numerical targets help to focus the issue and make it more real.
- The Plan needs to articulate that the MSCP will be implemented and that the success of the MSCP will be tracked. *This may deemphasize the approach to acquiring land outside the MSCP. If there is a non MSCP-specific number, then it allows other projects to be included. If a MSCP target is established, it should be addition to a target for non-MSCP acquisitions.*
- Not all habitat conservation efforts are associated with MSCP. I would hate to see us conserving public land that would let someone else off the hook. We should look at all MSCP targets and develop a robust effort to establish a solid number.
- There is a need to advance conservation of lands, but 10,000 acres represents about \$100M investment, which represents a significant amount of cost. So, in determining which projects advance for funding, there should be a balance with projects that address other targets.
- Although 10,000 acres might cost \$100M, we might only fund a small percentage of this. For instance, in developing the funding packages, it might be appropriate to allocate a certain percentage that would go to habitat and open space projects.
- The “and/or” language in the proposed Targets #1 and #2 is confusing. All three of the items should be equally weighted. *The language will be changed to “and”.*
- I suggest changing the language for Target #1 to indicate that the focus of the target is habitat that is most threatened. *The RWMG will take this back for discussion.*
- The 10,000 acres should be considered a minimum. *The RWMG will take this back for discussion.*

- I would like to see two general overarching statements: 1) The IRWM targets come from officially adopted targets established in other documents, 2) The targets are flexible and may change to reflect changes in the future.
- Should Target #3 focus on invasives that are close to wetlands or water bodies in order to have the maximum benefit to water quality?
- If invasives are not removed from upland areas as well, then they are more likely to return.
- There should be a provision to account for non-plant species such as the Quagga mussel. *The target will be modified, or a new one added to allow for this.*
- Staff should prepare suggested revisions based on this feedback.

Conclusions/Actions

The following changes to targets were proposed by the RAC:

Objective C

Target #1

- Include groundwater and seawater (as separate targets) and find ways to evaluate these.
- Say $\frac{3}{4}$ rather than 75%.

Target #2

- Add a reference that we will work with Regional Board.
- Be more aggressive in the timeframe.
- Coordinate this with the Regional Board schedule (three year review cycle).

Objective E

Target #2

- Add in reference date for starting point (date of adoption of Plan or other as appropriate).
- Include interim dates and total amount of capacity after expansion.
- Check the end date for all of the expansions to be complete.

Objective F

Target #3

- Change date to 2010.
- Add wording to indicate that the purpose of implementing the tracking system is to measure the rate of change in impervious surfaces with the goal of slowing the rate of increase.
- Measure the rate of increase of impervious services against an appropriate statistic (e.g. population growth).

Objective G

Target #5

- Consider extrapolating from trends to develop % reduction.
- Consider modifying target to be based on volume of spills rather than number.

Objective H

All

- Confirm that North County numbers are included (MSCP has not been finalized). If not included, scale accordingly.

Target #1

- Replace “and/or” with “and” so it reads: “Conserve...including functional riparian habitat, associated buffer habitat, and functional wetland habitat.”
- Focus on most threatened habitat.
- Change wording to “minimum of 10,000 acres”.

Target #2

- Replace “and/or” with “and” (see change to target 1).
- Focus on most threatened habitat.
- Change wording to “minimum of 1,000 acres”.

Target #3

- Modify language to include “nuisance species” removal target (i.e. to include non-native and exotic plants, non-plant species, etc.).
- Change wording to “minimum of 1,000 acres”.

Updates

Mr. Mark Stadler discussed Assembly Bill (AB) 1489, which did not clear the Assembly. A new version will be submitted. AB1489 would provide enabling legislation to Proposition 84 and would divide the State into Hydrologic Regions as defined in the California Water Plan.

Mr. Stadler also discussed the California Water Plan Regional meetings that will be occurring. An all-region meeting will be held in Ontario September 18 and 19.

Public workshops for Proposition 84 will be held on September 21 in Salinas, September 25 in Sacramento, and September 26 in Irvine. The RWMG will have representatives attending the Sacramento and Irvine meetings and will report back to the RAC on what is learned.

Mr. Kirk Ammerman provided a report on the Workgroup activities. He said that three meetings have been conducted with a fourth and final meeting on September 7. During the first two meetings, various different approaches were considered for reviewing projects. The Workgroup has sought to be as inclusive as possible. It was acknowledged that Prop 50 is focused on water supply and reliability, but not exclusively so. The Workgroup has developed a list of core projects and is building other projects into those that are complementary to build synergies. The projects being considered cover a broad range of issues.

Ms. Meleah Ashford provided an update on the La Jolla Integrated Coastal Water Management (ICWM) Plan. The ICWM Plan submitted a Step 1 application, but was ineligible for funding (as expected). A draft plan has been completed, which is available on the website, and there is a workshop on September 26. The Plan will be revised based on public comment and completed by November. The La Jolla ICWM will now work with the State to review and modify the ICWM Plan so that funding can be received in the future.

Mr. Stadler provided an update on the Delta smelt situation. A recent ruling has stated that the State Water Project (SWP) and the Central Valley Project (CVP) must leave a minimum amount of water in winter and spring for Delta smelt. This will result in significant restrictions on Delta pumping. It is estimated that a 30% reduction in SWP and CVP supplies will be experienced this winter as a direct result of the ruling. This is equivalent to 2 million acre feet, which is enough water to meet the needs of the San Diego region for three years. The ruling will take effect beginning on Christmas, and will last until June of next year. In the short term, there may be mandatory restrictions on water use.

Mr. Van Rhyn said that San Diego County has agreed to become partners with Borrego Springs to establish an IRWM Plan and pursue Prop 84 funding. This region will not compete with the San Diego Region. The County will be staff the effort through the Department of Planning and Land use (i.e. not personnel who are involved in San Diego IRWMP effort).

RAC Member Comments and Responses:

- We should coordinate with our legislators to ensure that funding under Proposition 84 is tied to a watershed.
- If the Prop 50 guidelines emphasize water supply, then our application package should focus on water supply. *The Workgroup will also include projects that are complementary to water supply projects. For example, land acquisition projects that protect reservoirs.*

Conclusions/Actions

None.

Future Agenda Items

Future RAC meetings are as follows:

- September 19: RAC meeting to finalize the project list for funding and consider recommending adoption of the Final IRWM Plan.
- October 9: RAC meeting to discuss Institutional Structure.

RAC Member Comments and Responses:

- The RAC's status as an ongoing institution should be discussed at the October 9 meeting, along with implementation issues and financing.
- How will administration of implementation projects be handled? *This will be discussed during the institutional structure meeting.*

Conclusions/Actions

The next RAC meeting will be held on September 19 from 9:00-11:30 am.

Public Comments

No public comments were received.