



**Regional Advisory Committee  
Meeting #12 Notes**

September 19, 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  
Chris Basilevac, The Nature Conservancy  
Dennis Bostad, Sweetwater Authority  
Neil Brown, Padre Dam Municipal Water District  
Kathleen Flannery, County of San Diego  
Linda Flournoy, Planning & Engineering for Sustainability  
Karen Franz, San Diego Coastkeeper  
Doug Gibson, San Elijo Lagoon Conservancy  
Rob Hustel, San Diego River Park Foundation  
Eric Larsen, Farm Bureau of San Diego County  
Keith Lewinger, Fallbrook Public Utility District  
Judy Mitchell, Mission Resource Conservation District  
Richard Pyle, San Diego Chamber of Commerce  
Marsi Steirer, City of San Diego  
Mike Thornton, San Elijo Joint Powers Authority  
Shelby Tucker, San Diego Association of Governments  
Ken Weinberg, San Diego County Water Authority  
Mark Weston, Helix Water District  
Susan Varty, Olivenhain Municipal Water District

**Attendance – RWMG Staff**

---

Cathy Pieroni, City of San Diego Water Department  
Cecilia Padres, County of San Diego  
Dana Frieauf, San Diego County Water Authority  
Mark Stadler, San Diego County Water Authority  
Sheri McPherson, County of San Diego  
Toby Roy, San Diego County Water Authority

**Attendance – Interested Parties to the RAC**

---

Alyson Watson, RMC Water and Environment  
Persephene St. Charles, RMC Water and Environment  
Amanda Schmidt, RMC Water and Environment  
Greg Kryz, on behalf of Meena Westford, United States Bureau of Reclamation  
Rick Alexander, Sweetwater Authority  
Mark Umphres, Helix Water District

### **Attendance – Public**

---

Larry Johnson, Campo Lake Morena Planning Group  
Peg Crilly, Citizen

### **Introductions**

---

Ms. Kathleen Flannery (Chairperson) welcomed Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) members to their 12<sup>th</sup> meeting. Brief introductions were made by all RAC members, consultants, and other members of the general public in attendance.

### **Finalize Measurable Targets**

---

Ms. Alyson Watson (RMC Water and Environment) discussed the updates to targets based on comments from the September 5 meeting.

Objective C: Four new targets were included in Objective C. These targets included specific timelines and numerical goals.

Objective E: Objective E included a revised target that specified interim increases in treatment capacity for imported and surface waters.

Objective F: The target pertaining to impervious surfaces was revised to indicate that the rate of change in impervious surfaces will be tracked regionally; language was added to supporting text to indicate that the goal of the target is to slow the rate of increase in impervious surfaces.

Objective G: Objective G was revised to indicate a quantitative reduction in the number of sanitary sewer overflows over 1,000 gallons in volume. The target includes the current quantity of sewer overflows and the future goal.

Objective H: New language was added in targets #1-3 to specify that targets represent a minimum threshold.

### **RAC Member Comments and Responses:**

Objective C:

- No comments

Objective D:

- Current volume of groundwater supply should be added to Target #4.

Objective E:

- Is this objective limited to surface water or does it include groundwater? *Groundwater is addressed in the targets associated with Objective D. The volumes of water are based upon planned water treatment plant capacity expansions.*
- Since the volume of imported and local water is projected in 2030, is it not reasonable to predict the volume of water down to the gallon, and targets should be rounded.
- Another item should be added to the Objective to include groundwater, seawater and other supply infrastructure. The “other” is intended not to exclude water sources not yet identified. *A target will be added similar to this target to address infrastructure needed to achieve the targets for Objective D.*

Objective F:

- Suggestion to add language as to what is being tracked. *The rate of change in area of impervious surfaces is being tracked.*

Objective G:

- Suggestion to add language or another target to reduce the total volume of sanitary sewer overflows by a specific amount per mile of collection system.

Objective H:

- Suggestion to not solely have the word “remove.” Revise to say “remove and control.”
- Are Targets #1-3 are obtainable? *The targets are keeping in line with other objectives and if multiple agencies are involved, like NGOs, local government, and private industry, the goals can be easily achieved.*
- Targets should be added to prevent the introduction of non-native species. *Language could be added to Target #4 to address this comment.*

Objective I:

- No comments

Conclusions/Actions

Objective D

- Add a new target to address infrastructure needed to achieve the targets for Objective D.
- Add current volume of groundwater supply.

Objective E

Target #2

- Change wording from “921 mgd in 2030” to “920 mgd in 2030”.

Objective F

Target #2

- Add the word “area” in target to show what is being tracked.

Objective G

- Add a new target to reduce the volume of sanitary sewer overflows per mile of collection system.

Objective H

Target #3

- Change wording to “remove and control.”

Target #4

- Add wording “and prevent introduction of.”

Voting Rules

Ms. Kathy Flannery discussed the options for voting on the adoption of the IRWM Plan. The two options for voting are majority (51%) approval or 2/3 approval. A comment was provided that 2/3 approval shows that the RWMG supports the project compares to just 51% approval.

Two votes will be raised during the meeting, for which voting rules should be determined:

- Vote 1: Formally Recommend that RWMG Governing Bodies Adopt the IRWM Plan

- Vote 2: Recommend that the SDCWA Board Approve the Proposed Funding Package and Give Authority to Submit the Funding Application

#### Conclusions/Actions

The RWMG decided that approval by a majority of the total RAC membership (a majority of the 25 RAC members, or 13 people) would constitute approval of vote. Each committee member's vote would be recorded and documented.

### **Consider Recommendation that the RWMG Governing Bodies Adopt the IRWM Plan**

Ms. Dana Frieauf discussed the timeline for preparing the IRWM Plan. She described the revisions to the Plan based on RAC input. She quoted the MOU and requested that the RAC recommended to the RWMG governing bodies approval of the final 2007 IRWM Plan for the San Diego Region. The floor was opened up for discussion.

#### RAC Member Comments and Responses:

- Some RAC members have not seen the final IRWM Plan and feel uncomfortable about voting on something they have not seen. *We have reviewed all of the comments with you and have posted our proposed responses to the website. The Public Draft IRWM Plan is on the IRWM Plan website and available for downloading, and the revisions to project scoring are posted as well.*
- What will happen if the RWMG does not approve the IRWM Plan? *This is not anticipated to occur. RAC members are encouraged to attend the RWMG governing body meetings and voice their support for IRWM Plan adoption.*
- A suggestion was made to select a representative from the RAC to be a spokesperson to deliver the IRWM Plan. Kirk Ammerman was nominated.
- How is the watershed approach being evaluated? *A RAC workgroup could be established to review the approach.*
- Is there language in the IRWM Plan to address Plan updates? *One of the short term priorities is to update the Plan.*

#### Conclusions/Actions

The RWMG unanimously voted to recommend that the RWMG governing bodies adopt the IRWM Plan.

### **Workgroup Update and Proposed Funding Package**

Mr. Kirk Ammerman provided a report on the Workgroup activities. He indicated the Proposition 50 grant application is the next step in the process. The Region plans to submit a grant application requesting the maximum amount of \$25 million. There is a possibility that between now and the application due date that a project may fall out due to scheduling or other reasons. Mr. Ammerman suggested an additional Workgroup meeting be held in the September/October timeframe to develop an approach for reallocating funds if a project falls out before the application due date; this approach will be presented to the RAC at the October 9 meeting.

Mr. Ammerman described the projects that the Workgroup identified as part of the recommended Prop 50 proposal package. He indicated that the projects are distributed evenly across the watershed

and across objectives. The next steps are for the RAC to vote to approve the proposed project package and to direct workgroup to reconvene to develop proposed approach to reallocate funding. The RWMG seemed pleased with the project list overall. Discussion was facilitated by Ms. Persephene St. Charles (RMC Water and Environment).

RAC Member Comments and Responses:

- Is the project package the strongest possible? Are there numerical ratings or other documentation from the consultants to prove this? *The Workgroup meeting minutes document the process. Numerical ranking was useful in determining core projects but was not used to identify all projects. Information is available on the IRWM Plan website.*
- Do we know what does the State wants as far as qualitative and quantitative ranking? *The consultant, RMC, has guided the Workgroup to crease a strong proposal package consistent with what the State is believed to want.*
- A comment was made to indicate that the group of projects included in the proposal package is geared to obtain Prop 50 funding.
- In Workgroup meetings, was a person allowed to vote on their own project? *Yes, the Workgroup did not want to penalize a project because the project proponent was volunteering in the Workgroup.*
- Comment: Even though a project did not get included in the package, it does not mean it is an inadequate project. It did not fit in for Prop 50 funding but may fit into Prop 84 funding.
- Can numerical ranking be provided to project proponents to show them how to improve for next funding opportunity? *Workgroup meeting minutes are available on the IRWM Plan website and would be the best source of information for project proponents. The numerical ranking did not directly dictate which projects made the grant package; the Workgroup was intentionally convened to add a subjective element to the process. It is recommended that project proponents look at the IRWM Plan objectives and targets, and specific funding guidelines, to develop projects for future funding opportunities.*
- In many cases, multiple projects were grouped together into one large project and then the Workgroup selected one of those projects to include in the funding package. How did the Workgroup determine or select what geographical area and/or project would be funded out of the group of projects? *The projects were viewed by category and hydrologic unit, with the goal of identifying a wide variety of projects across hydrologic units. Following consultation with and approval from project proponents, select large-budget projects were reduced in scale to allow them to be included, while targeting a specific geographic area.*

The RWMG facilitated discussion as to whether the Workgroup should reconvene to develop a process for identifying projects in the event that one of the current projects drops out.

RAC Member Comments and Responses:

- Is it possible to add new projects to the proposal package if some drop out? *Given the timeline for Prop 50, it would be extremely difficult to add the projects, but it is almost impossible to get the same level of information for the new projects as the old projects in such a short time frame.*

- Would it be possible in the application to have the project total cost exceed \$25 million yet only request \$25 million, then indicate to the State that projects A, B, and C don't have to be included if projects X, Y, and Z are included? *It is strongly recommended that this approach be avoided because it suggests that the feasibility/likelihood of some projects proceeding is questionable, and the overall package will not be as strong.*

#### Conclusions/Actions

The RWMG approved the proposed project list with 19 votes in support and 1 vote in opposition. The group agreed by consensus (knocking on table) to direct the Workgroup to meet again and develop approach to reallocate funding.

#### Updates

---

There will be a meeting in Ontario to discuss water supply, conveyance and water reliability.

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) sponsored a two-day "All Regions Workshop" in Ontario, CA on September 17 and 18 in order to receive local input on the development of the DWR's Water Plan 2009. The DWR presented information regarding two models being developed and tested for potential application at the state level or perhaps the local level:

- 1) water supply reliability based on predicted hydrology (beta test - Sacramento River region);
- 2) selecting among available water supply options when reliability assumptions are in flux (beta test - Inland Empire).

#### Future Agenda Items

---

Future RAC meetings are as follows:

- October 9: RAC meeting to discuss Institutional Structure.

#### Public Comments

---

No public comments were received.