



**Regional Advisory Council  
Meeting #3**

**Notes and Follow-up Action Items**

January 10, 2007, 9:00 a.m. – 11:30 am  
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  
Michael Bardin, Santa Fe Irrigation District  
Chris Basilevac, The Nature Conservancy  
Dennis Bostad, Sweetwater Authority  
Neal Brown, Padre Dam Municipal Water District  
Michael Connolly, Campo Kumeyaay Nation  
Kathleen Flannery, County of San Diego  
Linda Flournoy, Sustainability Consultant  
Doug Gibson, San Elijo Lagoon Conservancy  
Rob Hutsel, San Diego River Park Foundation  
Megan Johnson, Southern California Wetlands Recovery Network  
Eric Larsen, San Diego Farm Bureau  
Keith Lewinger, Fallbrook Public Utility District  
Judy Mitchell, Mission Resources Conservation District  
Rich Pyle, CH2M Hill  
Marsi Steirer, City of San Diego's Water Department  
Mike Thornton, San Elijo JPA  
Mark Weston, Helix Water District  
Ken Weinberg, San Diego County Water Authority  
Terresa Whitaker [alternate for Dr. Richard Wright], San Diego State University  
Susan Varty, Olivenhain Municipal Water District  
Karen Franz, San Diego Coast Keeper

**Attendance – Alternate RAC members**

---

Mark Umphres, Helix Water District  
Rick Alexander, Sweetwater Authority

**Attendance – RWMG Staff**

---

Dana Friehauf, San Diego County Water Authority  
Sheri McPherson, County of San Diego  
Cecilia Padres, County of San Diego  
Jeff Pasek, City of San Diego Water Department  
Cathy Pieroni, City of San Diego Water Department  
Toby Roy, San Diego County Water Authority  
Jeff Stephenson, San Diego County Water Authority  
Jon Van Rhyn, County of San Diego  
Maria Mariscal, San Diego County Water Authority

**Attendance – Public**

---

Jyo Purohit, Private Consultant, Sparkers, Inc.  
Meena Westford, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation  
Dan Noble  
Denise Landstedt, Dudek Engineering and Environmental  
Carolyn Schaeffer, Dudek Engineering and Environmental  
Grace Chan, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California  
Shea Petry, CDM

**Introductions**

Kathy Flannery welcomed the group and circulated the attendance sheet. Members introduced themselves. Ms. Flannery reviewed the ground rules and asked for any revisions to the notes from the 2<sup>nd</sup> RAC meeting. No revisions were requested.

**Preparation of draft IRWM Plan**

Ms. Dana Friehauf gave the presentation reviewing major elements of the draft IRWM Plan. Ms. Friehauf began by reviewing the schedule through March 23<sup>rd</sup> when the draft IRWM Plan is expected to be released to the public for review. The group had no comments or suggestions related to the schedule.

Ms. Friehauf noted that the RWMG scheduled a meeting with DWR's Tracey Billington to take place this Friday, January 10. She also noted an upcoming workshop in Los Angeles on Proposition 50 funding:

**January 31, 2007 – 10:00 a.m.**  
L.A. County Public Works  
Alhambra Room  
900 South Fremont Avenue  
Alhambra, CA 91803

Next, Ms. Friehauf reviewed Sections A and B of the draft IRWM Plan. These sections reference all water management plans from the San Diego region.

The question was asked as to why the draft IRWM Plan currently identifies goals and objectives on behalf of the region rather than by the watersheds within the region.

Mr. Jeff Pasek offered that it makes more sense to for the San Diego region to plan regionally rather than by watershed units primarily because:

- 1) Not all watersheds in the San Diego region have fully formed plans and are capable of participating in the IRWM Planning process as discreet planning entities; and
- 2) San Diego's issues cut across its watersheds.

It was then suggested by a RAC member that perhaps we should use watershed planning later when time allows, but that watershed planning was not feasible given the limited time available for current grant funding opportunities. It was added that the Plan's strategies should be prioritized prior to the prioritization of projects.

It was also noted that participants previously attempted to submit the Calleguas Creek Watershed Plan as a separate plan and the State would not accept it. The State clearly wanted a plan representing the entire region.

Mr. Jon Van Rhyn continued with a presentation regarding the concept of "integration" as represented by the Department of Resources.

Mr. Van Rhyn asked the question, "How do we define 'integrated'?" The Department of Water Resources (DWR) promotes a definition wherein regional efforts (planning, regulatory, projects, etc.) result in multiple benefits – when multiple goals and objectives are satisfied as a result of these efforts.

A comment was made by a RAC member that integration is best applied through the watershed planning units. It was also asked how can plans, regulations, projects, etc. can occur in an integrated fashion without the water agencies are sitting down with conservancy and other groups to determine goals and objectives.

Mr. Van Rhyn noted that the collaborative process has not yet been determined and it is the goal of the RWMG to receive guidance from the RAC on this matter. Determining a process promoting integration of efforts to enhance water supply reliability in the San Diego region is the fourth goal of the draft IRWM Plan and will be addressed in that section.

Another RAC member expressed the opinion that integration did not have to do so much with geography, but rather with the ability to do away with competing efforts and ultimately arrive at a regional consensus of priorities.

Other comments from the RAC members included:

- Where does Wastewater treatment best fit? Water supply or water quality?
- How do those areas that have not yet submitted projects for inclusion in the IRWM Plan have their issues captured in this version of the IRWM Plan? Should we do more outreach now or describe future efforts for outreach in this version of the IRWM Plan?
- Can we get consensus first on the determination of goals as identified in the PowerPoint?
- Should we add a cost-effectiveness element to the prioritization process?
- Concern about requiring “consensus” within the region in the determination of prioritization of objectives and strategies. This may not be practical.
- The overarching goal of the IRWM Plan should be the quality of life for the San Diego region.
- Need to tighten up definitions of qualifiers such as “significant”, “broad” and “benefits”.
- Should rank the goals first. Should projects accomplishing all 4 goals be given preference?
- We should look into utilizing tools for evaluating and determining priorities among goals.
- Sometimes goals run in tandem. For example, having a dominant water supply with inferior water quality is not tenable. It seems that the prioritization of goals may evolve from the prioritization of projects.
- The regional priority should have broad applicability rather than a regional priority being site specific.
- Goals might be different when site specific. Localized goals are in danger of being muted when looking at regional picture.

Mr. Van Rhyn noted that the RWMG intentionally put forward discussion items at a more conceptual level today for discussion and guidance. He asked for comments related to specific goals and priorities.

**Comments related to Goal 1 – Optimize Water Supply Reliability:**

- Instead of “optimize”, should say “ensure long-term” or else say something about long-term demands. Should add the Water Authority’s water facilities master plan. Add “create drought-proof water supply”.
- Can “conservation-measures” be a stand-alone item instead of lumped together with the other local supplies?
- The goals, objectives, challenges, strategies, regional priorities can all be updateable.
- Say local “water” supplies. I disagree that we want to implement the Water Authority plan as opposed to using some overarching goal of the Water Authority. I don’t want to say that a goal of our plan is to implement the Water Authority’s plan.
- Good idea. We all have plans and to single some out plans. We should keep it broad.
- We should add energy and exchanges of water transfers as strategies.
- I’m concerned that this is much too general. This is the place where the water supply people should say that these are the most important strategies.

- Water management strategies are associated with conserving water or creating additional water supply, it seems to me that brine management and wastewater treatment and disposal should be moved to water quality.
- I agree with the previous comment if it can also stay in Water Supply. So, there are two issues on the same project so let's put it on the both goals.
- As you go to the public, the public needs to understand this. How will the public receive this and understand and question the decisions made in this committee. I know that there is a lot of uncertainty about what water supply reliability means, so there should be something specific here – quantify it. What does “optimize” mean?
- It makes sense to at least include the 11 plus goals and have them cross over other goals.
- Cross-reference so it's also under strategy so you can see its relationship in the other goals.

### **Comments received related to Goal 2 – Protect and Enhance Water Quality:**

- Can we actually work on decreasing impervious surfaces instead of just decreasing impacts of impervious surfaces?
- Incorporate something about sustainable development.
- I'd like to see the “treatability” of source water supplies added.
- Why are we limiting ourselves to just 1, 2 and 3? Maybe add a #4 for “other”?
- TDS and nutrients are a totally different topic.
- I'm concerned about things that we're not addressing emerging contaminants.
- I'm concerned that we're trying to add everything to this list. I recommend going with the 80/20 approach. We don't need to be entirely comprehensive. Let's not accept that there's no way to reduce impacts from impervious surfaces.

### **Comments received related to Goal 3 – Provide Stewardship of our Natural Resources:**

- In the 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet, there are 3 “m” words to add, “monitoring, management and maintenance”.
- When I look at acquisition of habitat, not all habitats have equal value to wildlife agencies. The most difficult habitat to maintain is wetlands. Do we want to address that?
- It's just as important to acquire upland habitat to protect water supplies.
- Increase the quality of existing habitat and space through monitoring, management, and maintenance. Also, perhaps a better word is “conservation” or “preservation” instead of “acquisition”.
- Define “habitat”
- Mitigation is not a priority.
- Add urban wild space
- We need to narrow down our priorities now, not expand.

**Comments received related to Goal 4 – Coordinate and Integrate Water Resource Management:**

- “Integrated” is the first word in IRWM Planning. Joe Caves wanted something separate from the Bay-Delta approach. He envisioned that if you could get disparate groups together with the one goal of saving a watershed then you will be rewarded and make the region better. Integration should be the first goal. If it doesn’t integrate amongst the different groups, then it shouldn’t go on to the other goals. This should be Goal #1.
- Why is only 1 strategy for this Goal listed? Surely there are others.
- Instead of the watershed principle vaguery, one of the possible draft regional strategies would be to organize by watershed to achieve the other 3 goals. We should promote an organized system and start to try to do that.
- Consider integrating our watershed management plans into the Plan as a strategy.
- I like the idea of this being Goal #1.
- I would like to argue against prioritizing the goals. It implies that whatever is #4 is least important.
- Imagine a big circle being Goal #4 and the other 3 Goals are circles within it. We are starting with the big watershed – the ocean.
- I think we need something stronger of individual public stewardship and education.
- Is the goal to provide long-term coordination and integration of water resource management planning or to provide a cooperative structure to create that? I believe the latter is what we should do.

After the review of the four Goals, Mr. Van Rhyn continued his presentation with an update of the current list of projects. Currently, the RWMG has received 320 projects representing over \$4 billion in estimated costs. All of these projects have passed a simple litmus test for applicability (must be consistent with the goals, objectives and strategies of the IRWM Plan) for inclusion. Projects will continue being collected through the end of the public comment period, expected to be May 2007.

Mr. Van Rhyn presented a conceptual model whereby the projects are ranked according to whatever criteria are developed by the IRWM Plan. Criteria are developed in accordance with the prioritization of goals and strategies for the region. A subset of criteria might relate to a particular funding source’s criteria for funding.

Mr. Van Rhyn reviewed systems utilized by other regions for prioritizing projects:

- American River Basin (Sacramento) – their projects and programs were evaluated using three types of criteria and there were other considerations such as readiness to proceed, fundability, etc.
- Greater LA Region – similar process except they do not have specific criteria, it is just conceptual for the next phase of IRWMP development.

- North Coast – they went through a very detailed set of questions. Projects were assigned a numeric score using a score sheet that is based upon the state IRWM Plan grant program criteria and individually reviewed by the Technical Peer Group.

Mr. Van Rhyn noted that right now we have not identified any prioritization of San Diego's projects. He submitted to the group that we don't need to know right now. However, we do need to know the process for determining the region's prioritization to be in compliance with Proposition 50 expectations.

Mr. Van Rhyn referenced a handout outlining 3 levels of prioritization. Mr. Van Rhyn indicated that it is the intent of the RWMG to include in the IRWM Plan an appendix which will describe exactly how we will weight projects for funding under Proposition 50, Cycle 2.

Comments from the group included:

- The general columns are too big.
- According to the IRWM Plan, 320 projects need to be ranked and sorted. I want to see that output.
- The critical issue is, how broad the prioritization should be?
- I have concerns about general ranking. If we're just developing a universal plan. What did we learn in the first round? If you look at how they score things, some of these things that are pass/fail were high-scoring previously.
- Integration should be the highest priority. If you want your project to receive a good score it needs to be integrated.
- We're focusing on individual projects right now. There needs to be a collective process.
- If you look at the IRWM Plan guidelines, you need to prioritize projects and identify schedule for implementation.
- Use priorities to rank projects for the plan, but what's on the handout is for Prop 50 ranking.
- It might be helpful to see what other groups have done in detail and that might help us decide what we want to do.
- I'd like a numerical system. The Pajaro Plan does this.
- Agreed. Projects need to be prioritized.
- Be aware that at least one of the top 7 scoring Plans did not prioritize their projects (LA).

Ms. Toby Roy noted that the RWMG will hire a consultant to assist with the IRWM Plan development and should be on board by the end of February.

Mr. Van Rhyn noted that integration does require a deliberative process. What that process is remains to be determined. He then continued with his presentation regarding collective evaluation of projects for funding proposals.

Additional comments received from the group include:

- There's not enough emphasis on integration across disciplines. There's too much emphasis on the region. We need to separate the concept that "integration" is the same as "regional".

- The key is to see the scoring matrix. One way to handle this is to have some bonus points for addressing multiple disciplines.

Ms. Flannery concluded the meeting and gave the status of the following action items:

- MOU language and draft Mission Statement were handed out for consideration.
- The RFP for consultant services supporting the IRWM Plan development has been issued. Proposals are due January 29, 2007. The RWMG will interview candidates February 1, 2007 and expects to make a selection February 2, 2007. The Water Authority's Board is scheduled to review the item for approval in February.

An update was provided by a RAC member for a project (La Jolla Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS)) that is submitting a similar application for IRWM Plan funding under Proposition 50 for special coastal water management. The intent is for the two IRWM Plans (La Jolla ASBS and the region's) to be linked.