



Regional Advisory Council Meeting Notes

February 27, 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
Michael Bardin, Santa Fe Irrigation District
Chris Basilevac, The Nature Conservancy
Melissa Estes, Campo Kumeyaay Nation
Kathleen Flannery, County of San Diego
Linda Flournoy, Sustainability Consultant
Rob Hutsel, San Diego River Park Foundation
Megan Johnson, Southern California Wetlands Recovery Network
Keith Lewinger, Fallbrook Public Utility District
Judy Mitchell, Mission Resources Conservation District
Rich Pyle, CH2M Hill
Shelby Tucker, San Diego Association of Governments
Mark Weston, Helix Water District & Mark Umphres, alternate
Ken Weinberg, San Diego County Water Authority
Susan Varty, Olivenhain Municipal Water District
Mike Thornton, San Elijo Joint Powers Authority

Attendance – RWMG Staff

Dana Frieauf, 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
Jeff Stephenson, San Diego County Water Authority
Maria Mariscal, San Diego County Water Authority
Jon Van Rhyn, County of San Diego

Attendance – Public

Larry Johnson, Campo / Lake Morena Planning Group
Jyo Purohit, Private Consultant, Sparkers, Inc.
Eleanora Robbins, Campo EPA
Peg Crilly
Nancy Gardiner, Brown and Caldwell
Grace Chan, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
Marty Leavitt, Resource Conservation District of Greater San Diego County

Introductions

Ms. Kathy Flannery welcomed RAC members to their fourth meeting and indicated that she will be the Chair and facilitator for this meeting. RAC members that notified the RWMG of planned absence to this meeting were listed and changes in the RAC meeting schedule were noted. Additionally, some new ground rules were added: turn off/down cell phones; please speak up and use microphones; take turns speaking and give others a chance to speak by allowing at least two people speak before re-speaking; and use the parliament procedure of tapping (knocking on table) when in agreement or to indicate support of a statement.

The consultant team RMC Water and Environment were introduced and provided an overview of experience and insight on IRWM Planning to the group. RMC will be assisting the RWMG and RAC with the finalization of the Plan, helping to define a prioritization process and governance structure, coordinating public outreach and meeting facilitation, and preparing grant applications.

RAC members, RWMG staff, and Public Attendees provided brief introductions.

The County Water Authority (CWA) noted that the new MOU for the RWMG agencies was adopted by CWA and will soon be adopted/approved by the City of San Diego and County of San Diego. The MOU sets forth the process for meetings to be held in compliance with the Brown Act. Therefore, discussion should be limited to formal meetings; avoid using email and reply all to start discussion which should be discussed in a public setting.

Update on IRWM Planning and Funding in California

Ms. Dana Frieauf presented a PowerPoint presentation which summarized the latest actions and proposed actions by the State in regards to IRWM funding and legislation. The RWMG is opposed to the funding recommendations and has attended numerous meetings and hearings, and sent letters regarding the issue. Ms. Frieauf thanked those who also participated by attending or sending letters. Senators Ducheny and Kehoe, among other legislators and organizations, also sent letters in opposition to the State. The funding proposal is being reconsidered and the Prop 50 agenda item for the State Water Resources Control Board was held over to the next meeting on March 20, 2007.

It was also noted that latest indications from the State suggest that the readiness-to-proceed factor will be a key component considered during grant proposal evaluations. The State has recognized the need to expedite the grant application and award process so that funding is provided to grant recipients in a reasonable time frame. Also, rising construction costs are seen as a driving factor because the rising costs will continue to limit the benefit received from funding the various IRWM projects.

Prop 84 will be administered by the Department of Water Resources (DWR) only. Our funding region is currently defined by DWR to include South Orange County (San Juan) and South Riverside County (Santa Margarita).

Some feedback we have received from the State indicates that revised IRWM Plan standards for Prop. 84 will include the need for performance measures and targets, the need to include and consider strategies named within the California Water Plan, Bulletin 160, and the need for more thorough discussion on institutional structure. The draft San Diego Region IRWM Plan will address these revised standards.

There will be a local Funding Hearing that will be held at CWA on March 12, 2007.

RAC Member Comments and Responses:

- Should the State's proposal go through as is, the remaining \$33 million would be rolled into both Prop 84 and Coastal Management Plans, and would also eliminate the Cycle Two grant application process for Prop 50.
- The group should consider the financing of the Plan and projects and where is the money going to come from. The Plan is funded and on track; project readiness, including ability to supply matching funds, will be a key factor in project selection.
- The current project list should be re-sorted to show those project that are ready to go, or close to ready. Those that are close to ready to proceed could then be encouraged to finalize project plans and identify funding sources so that they can also compete. A re-sorted list will be developed and provided to the group. In talking with the State, this should help in showing our Region's level of readiness-to-proceed.
- RAC members were under the impression that our region was defined to San Diego County; that is something everyone should follow up on with legislators.
- The definition of the San Diego region is not clearly defined within the Prop. 84.

Measurable Targets for Achieving San Diego IRWM Plan Objectives

Mr. Jon VanRhyn discussed the need for the IRWM Plan to contain performance measures and described how the RWMG went about drafting targets. Targets are either quantifiable numerically or through the ability to measure progress. Several targets are shown with 'xxx' as a place marker; input is needed from the RAC to formulate those numbers. All targets are designed to require collaborative efforts for attainment. Targets were provided representative to each of the Plan Objectives.

RAC Member Comments and Responses:

A. Promote economic, social, and environmental sustainability

- What does sustainability mean? It is the balance between the earth's needs and human needs. From Linda Flournoy (submitted after the meeting): "Sustainability is achieved by managing the interaction of man with the natural environment in such a way that both can flourish". In practical terms, this means making choices about policies, programs, and projects that help, support, use, and/or mimic natural systems and processes – at similar scales – so that the vital support services they provide in turn to all life on the planet can function fully and efficiently. Sustainability suggest that we learn from nature how to deal with problems in ways which do not create more problems.
- This may be a better fit as an over-arching goal. This objective needs some boundaries; it is too broad of a statement
- This objective either needs to be taken out or moved – it seems out of order.
- Economic, Environmental, and Social sustainability are all applicable to water management and should be reflected somehow
- This item should be placed in the 'Parking Lot' for further discussion

B. Maximize stakeholder /community involvement and stewardship

- This is a good objective.
- Include a target to measure behavioral change

- Underserved communities should be included, not emphasized; reword.
 - All communities should be included, including affluent groups and unique groups to the Region.
 - The website should have a separate page for each watershed. Communities should be encouraged to coordinate by watershed.
 - Watershed discussion should be kept to Objective C.
 - Provide a percentage of the population as a measurable target, as opposed to numbers of people.
 - The website should be interactive.
 - We need to consider and implement public relations
- C. Promote integrated or regional approaches to water management planning
- This objective should be Objective A, or the top priority Objective.
 - The objective should state both integrated and regional, instead of 'or'.
 - Add the word develop to the objective.
 - Does 'and' create unintended limits? For instance, if a project addresses one and not the other, then it doesn't get counted for achieving the objective.
 - Target #8: should say 'initiate', not 'implement'
 - Target #6: is 2010 soon enough?
 - Add an interim target for 2008; maybe for Plan completion and implementation.
 - Developing a management structure is key; should move the target date to 2008 not 2010
 - Target #6: separate into two targets: long-term institutional structure, and the role of watersheds in watershed management planning
 - There should be more interim targets
 - Note that most projects could be considered 'Regional' since all of the land areas in our Region drain to the same outfall...the ocean
 - Add a target for 2012 to update the IRWM Plan
 - Add the word approaches: integrated approaches and regional approaches
 - Make milestones to achieve each target
- D. Effectively obtain, manage and assess water resource data and information
- Everyone likes the objective
 - Does the term 'standards' refer to both the management and collection of data? Yes.
- E. Develop and maintain a diverse mix of water resources
- Everyone likes the objective
 - Target #16: should state 'local' supplies, and include source water protection guidelines
 - What about groundwater supplies not requiring demineralization?
 - Based on the General Plan, there is a limited ability to develop groundwater and this should be reflected. A target from the General Plan could be to develop or utilize 280k acre feet by 2020
 - Need to make more of a connection to limits on growth
 - Targets 12-14 produce waste product; should consider identifying a way to target the re-use or disposal of the waste.
 - Add a target: fully implement water transfers by xxx
 - Add 200,000 acre feet from water transfers
 - Add words such as minimum to some targets

- Add a target addressing increased water recycling as a resources, and rain water capture
- Target #15: should also address climate change impacts on watershed health; such as increasing water infiltration benefits groundwater supply
- Target #17: add the term quality
- Create a target which measures the supplies benefits to people and the environment
- Target #11-14, add amounts in terms of percentage increases
- Remove the word regional from Targets 11 & 13
- Target #15: Why is climate change only addressed in context of the Urban Water Management Plan?
- Add a climate change target to Objective H
- When considering targets, we need to evaluate the implicated costs. For example, do we want to have desalination as a target when it costs so much?
- There should be a requirement for a cost/benefit analysis prior to determining whether a target is practicable.
- Add some clarification to the presentation of the targets regarding the ramifications of not meeting targets; how will they be evaluated; what will we do to address needed changes....etc

F. Construct, operate, and maintain a reliable water infrastructure system

- Everyone likes this objective
- Is this objective inter-related to Objective E? It seems redundant.
- Should Target #18 be moved to Objective E?
- Target 18: reword to state that we will develop supplies to meet emergency needs and incorporate efficient resource use.
- Expand Target #18
- Add a target for efficient use of reservoirs
- Consider the linkage between energy and water supply use
- Target #20: add quantities; maybe include a target for treated water and storage to address seasonality vs. demands
- Should there be a Target to address wastewater lines or other water-related waste removal needs and their plans?

G. Minimize the negative effects on waterways caused by hydromodification and flooding

- Change the word minimize in the objective wording, use reduce instead
- Expand Objective to provide clarity
- Define hydromodification; does it include dams?
- What about land use controls for flood prone areas?
- What about positive targets: for example, reducing impervious surfaces. See the Watershed Management Plans for targets regarding imperviousness and land acquisition.
- Add water conservation targets, which is also a cross-benefit from infiltration
- Mention the stormwater permit to explanation for these targets
- Expand Objective to address watershed health

H. Support attainment of the beneficial uses of the Region's waters

- Add a climate change target
- The wording of this objective seems off

- Consider stating ‘Support the attainment of Water Quality Objectives that attain beneficial uses of the Region’s waters’
- We need to scrutinize the 303d, TMDL, Basin Planning process: they are not necessarily accurate
- The targets should reflect the need to review and make the Basin Plan applicable to Regional issues and needs
- Target #'s 23-24: the dates seem to far out
- Why is their not a target date for #26
- Targets 23 & 24 need clarifying to say that we will validate the beneficial uses and Basin Plan
- Re-write Target 24
- Beneficial uses are not necessarily correctly identified. The wording should state that we will first evaluate their accuracy, then assess whether they are being attained.
- Target #25 assumes that TMDLs are correct, when they may be based on bad science. There should be an interim target to validate the TMDL.
- Targets @5 & 26 may conflict
- Add the word ‘initial’ to the phrase regarding emphasis on 303(d)
- Should address process standards
- Just stating ‘validating’ is not enough
- We should establish schedules for TMDLs and create a target to prevent TMDLs – be proactive
- We should add something requiring the participation in the evaluation and review of the Basin Plan.

I. Effectively Manage sources of pollutants and stressors

- Within the objective, define the word stressors; do we mean environmental stressors?
- Replace the word manage with reduce
- Everyone likes the targets
- Targets #25-26 could also be under Objective H
- Target 28 can be regional
- Add a target regarding proactiveness: source management; anticipate regulatory changes, etc.

J. Restore and maintain habitat and open space

- Add the word protect to the objective
- Target #29: change the word or to and
- This objective should be tied to water management (consensus)
- Other agencies are actively doing these things – what is their relationship with this Plan? Who is doing it? Will IRWM make it happen? Or will IRWM help to coordinate?
- In order to maintain, we need to manage; consider rephrasing the objective
- All habitats are not included in NCP and MSCPs
- This objective implies that all lands are damaged or in need of repair.
- This objective is describing a required action – should the word coordinate be added?
- Do we want to maintain or manage?

K. Optimize recreational opportunities

- Change the word optimize to increase

- Target #33 does not reflect the written definition as read by Jeff Pasek, from the expanded version of the Objectives handout provided in Meeting #1
- Add educational tools as a target
- Add the words protect and improve to the objective – see previous handout
- Not all projects can offer recreational opportunities and may be incompatible

Over-arching Comments:

- Number the targets with reference to the objective; for example, C1, C2, C3.....

Public Comments

- For data management objectives C & D, if you call out Common Ground, should call out other mechanisms such as SWAMP
- Data Management standards shouldn't have a target date of 2010, should be sooner
- Data management costs should be incorporated into project proposals
- Common Ground is a centralized system but it lacks controls and does not address the compatibility issue
- A sub-requirement to projects should be to manage data and fund data management for the region
- Include education requirements within project criteria
- Diversity of projects and region applicability will increase our competition
- The IRWM is a collaborative process and a collaborative process should be included within our objectives and targets
- Objective C, Target 6 implies roles and responsibilities which are not defined in the explanation or within the text. Adding roles and responsibilities would help with validation of the target
- Need to ensure public buy in and support

Comments received via email:

- Need to update this plan at least every five years; in addition, the plan should project into the future by 50-100 years.
- Objective A: Are we expecting an ever-increasing need for water? We need to be aware of the limits of water and avoid tipping the balance of earth's natural cycles. We need to focus on conserving and curbing water usage. This will provide for both economic and social sustainability.
- Objective B: getting people involved in a hands-on approach is important, but it also needs to include an education component. Consider using bioregional or watershed based education; this will increase people's sense of place and ownership of water resources. Also it is critical to involve the business community and seek their support. Consider holding educational, community-based water events and programs that include the arts, different cultures, communities, Tribal Nations, faith-based communities, and youth to increase people's connection to and awareness of water quality.
- Need to seriously look at learning more about a sustainable future.

Additional comment from the RAC

- Add a goal addressing cost benefit analysis and time frame requirements.

RAC Homework

Mr. VanRhyn referred RAC members to the handout titled Sample Worksheet for Prioritization of Regional IRWM Objectives: this handout will be revised to reflect the discussed changes to the wording of the Objectives and emailed out to the group. Upon receipt, fill out the form, selecting three objectives that should be the highest priority and three objectives which should be the lowest priority for the IRWM Plan. Return completed forms via email within one week from receipt.

Next Meeting and Closing Remarks

The next meeting of the RAC will be March 19, 2007 at 1:30 PM at the Water Authority. On March 12, 2007 there will be a Regional Funding Hearing attended by the State; this meeting is open to the RAC and public. Ms. Flannery thanked the members of the RAC for their participation.