



**Regional Advisory Council
Meeting #6 Notes**

April 23, 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
Neal Brown, Padres Dam Municipal Water District
Michael Connolly, Campo Kumeyaay Nation
Kathleen Flannery, County of San Diego
Linda Flournoy, Sustainability Consultant
Karen Franz, San Diego Coastkeeper
Doug Gibson, San Elijo Lagoon Conservancy
Rob Hutsel, San Diego River Park Foundation
Megan Johnson, Southern California Wetlands Recovery Network
Eric Larson, Farm Bureau of San Diego County
Keith Lewinger, Fallbrook Public Utility District
Judy Mitchell, Mission Resources Conservation District
Marsi Steirer, City of San Diego
Mike Thornton, San Elijo Joint Powers Authority
Mark Weston, Helix Water District
Ken Weinberg, San Diego County Water Authority
Meena Westford, U.S. Department of Interior Bureau of Reclamation
Dr. Richard Wright, Department of Geography, San Diego State University
Susan Varty, Olivenhain Municipal Water District

Attendance – RWMG Staff and Consultants

Dana Frieauf, San Diego County Water Authority
Sheri McPherson, County of San Diego
Cecilia Padres, County of San Diego
Jeffery Pasek, City of San Diego Water Department
Cathy Pieroni, City of San Diego Water Department
Toby Roy, San Diego County Water Authority
Jon Van Rhyn, County of San Diego
Tom Richardson, RMC Water & Environment
Kate Streams, RMC Water & Environment
Alyson Watson, RMC Water & Environment
Michael Welch, Welch Consulting

Attendance – Interested Parties to the RAC

Robyn Badger, San Diego Zoological Society
Grace Chan, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
Larry Johnson, Campo / Lake Morena Planning Group
Kelly Hendrickson, San Diego Zoological Society
Krista Mendelsohn, Resource Conservation District of Greater San Diego County
Geoffrey Smith, The Escondido Creek Conservancy

Attendance – Public

Peg Crilly
Jane Signaigo-Cox, SANDAG
Grace Chan, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California

Introductions

Ms. Kathy Flannery (RAC Chair) welcomed RAC members to their sixth meeting. Brief introductions were made by all RAC members, consultants, interested parties, and members of the general public in attendance.

Mr. Jeffery Pasek provided an overview of a combined tour and meeting that was hosted by the Regional Water Management Group on Friday, April 20. Norman Shopay and Anna Angham of the Department of Water Resources (DWR) and Scott Couch of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) were introduced to the San Diego region. The tour was conducted to increase the DWR and SWRCB representatives' understanding of water management challenges, issues, and projects, focusing on middle part of the San Diego watershed. Project highlighted on the tour included Padre Dam Municipal Water District's recycled water projects; Santee recreation projects; reservoir, dam, and emergency storage projects; river rehabilitation projects.

The tour was followed by a question and answer session at Helix Water District's treatment plant. The discussion focused on the status of IRWM planning in the region; the prioritization process as envisioned by the region; and the anticipated timing of steps for Cycle 2 of Proposition 50.

RAC Member Comments and Responses:

- Who initiated the meeting? *The meeting was initiated by the Regional Water Management Group, based on previous discussions in which the SWRCB and Department of Water Resources had expressed interest in such a tour. The tour allowed the representatives to look at actual projects, rather than just the plan, to improve their understanding of what the San Diego region looks like. The projects that were visited were intended to illustrate water resources management projects throughout the region.*

Updates – Proposition 50 & Proposition 84

Ms. Dana Frieauf presented a PowerPoint presentation summarized the latest actions and proposed actions by the State with regard to Propositions 50 and 84. The draft guidelines for Cycle 2 of Proposition 50 were released on Thursday, April 19. The process will proceed in two steps, consistent with Cycle 1. To be competitive, regions must prioritize projects in the plan.

Unlike Proposition 50, Proposition 84 has predetermined regional boundaries, and the San Diego Region under Proposition 84 includes southern portions of Orange and Riverside Counties. These

regions would prefer to be kept separate from the San Diego IRWMP, but the RWMG is currently coordinating with them to prepare for Proposition 84.

RAC Member Comments and Responses:

- Proposition 50 carries a minimum funding match requirement, which requires funds from non-state sources to be made available by the grant recipient. Who is responsible for providing the matching funds, and at what point do funds need to be provided? *Proponents of projects for which funding is pursued will be responsible for providing matching funds for their projects; these funds can be part of the cost of the project or planning costs, and may consist of in-kind services. Proposition 50 requires a 10 percent match based on the total proposal funding request, rather than on a project-by-project basis. It is unclear when these funds will need to be secured, though it is likely that funds must be secured by the time of the funding award (estimated as June of 2008). This question will be asked of the State.*
- The City of San Diego, County of San Diego, and San Diego Water Authority was recognized for the effort associated with getting the IRWM planning effort to the current point.
- What was the total amount of funding allocated under the first round? The State allocated \$307 M in Round 1.

Conclusions/Actions

- The group will ask the State when matching funds need to be secured.

Summary of Comments on IRWM Plan Prioritization

Ms. Alyson Watson (RMC Water & Environment) gave a PowerPoint presentation summarizing comments received on the integration and prioritization sections of the IRWMP. Mr. Tom Richardson (RMC Water & Environment) facilitated discussion around the comments received prior to the meeting as well as new comments.

RAC Member Comments and Responses:

- The role of objectives in ranking/prioritization is unclear.
- The prioritization process was difficult to follow and should be simplified if possible. Requested changes include adding flow charts, tables and summaries to simplify the explanation.
- There are a lot more projects than funding available, and there should be some way to identify what the priorities are rather than having all projects in the plan. For example, some projects seem to be focused on infrastructure maintenance and their relationship to integrated regional water management planning is weak.
- The RAC should have the discussion of what they view to be important projects for the Plan and for each watershed.
- Proposition 50 uses different strategies than the IRWMP. There are less watershed, habitat, and ecosystem strategies in the California Water Plan, and additional strategies should be added to address this.
- Members are uncomfortable with using strategies as the main ranking criteria.
- What is the advantage of prioritizing for the plan? *To be considered for Proposition 50, projects must be prioritized in the plan at some level. Recognizing that this is a plan, and in the interest of maximizing flexibility for future use, all projects were retained in the plan.*

- Comments from the last meeting were not incorporated. Who is deciding which comments to incorporate and when? *At the beginning of the last RAC meeting, the RAC was given a choice to either see their comments incorporated into the administrative draft IRWMP and receive the draft later than planned, or not see their comments reflected until the public draft IRWMP. It was agreed that comments would not be incorporated into the administrative draft IRWMP because doing so would hold up release of the draft. Comments received at RAC meetings 6 through 8 and written comments received will be reflected in the public draft IRWMP, to be released the first week of June. The RWMG will incorporate all comments possible.*
- Does the Plan deal with projects on a regional or watershed basis, or a combination of the two? *This iteration of the Plan takes more of a regional perspective, while retaining the hydrologic units to organize projects. Future iterations should do a better job of focusing on individual hydrologic units and watersheds.*
- There should be an enhanced discussion on watersheds in the plan. Information can be pulled from the various watershed plans, including watershed specific priorities and issues.
- The plan does what is asked by Proposition 50 and performs an initial prioritization, but it is time to start weeding out projects. To do that, members of RAC need to clearly understand prioritization process. Clear explanation and diagramming of pages F7 – F9 could increase understanding of how the first cut took place.
- General comment on Strategy 9 (Ecosystem Restoration): this strategy seems too generic. Ecosystem preservation should be included as well.
- Sustainability and integration of projects have been left out of the process. This topic can be reconnected back into the vision, with an added discussion on the holistic nature of the strategy. Specific comments for including sustainability and a definition of what is meant by sustainability will be sent to the full RAC for consideration.
- Recognizing that the project list will change over time, the plan should be structurally independent of the projects. *In order to be consistent with Proposition 50 requirements, the IRWMP must include a prioritized project list.*
- The projects should be placed in a separate section of the Plan – such as an Appendix, instead of in the middle of the Plan, which bogs it down.
- A discussion should be added that recognizes the commitment to public transparency.
- It would be helpful if the document could be made available online to facilitate searching. *Because this was only the administrative draft, which was made available to the RAC but not the general public, it will not be posted on the website but can be made available on CD. The public draft, to be released the first week of June will be posted to the website.*
- Integration and partnerships already exist in the region among existing groups across watersheds, jurisdictions, etc should be emphasized.
- The current draft does clearly recognize stormwater, gray water, and wastewater as potential sources of water, with multi—purpose solutions and benefits.
- Project screening should include 1) if the project is sustainable, 2) the # of partnerships, 3) the must-haves.
- Extra points should be awarded for a project's inclusion within existing plans.
- An enhanced description of existing plans should be added to Section M, which includes a description of each, and their contribution to the IRWM Plan.
- Add minimum criteria for a project's ability to address or meet the Plan's targets.

Conclusions/Actions

- The group will incorporate as many of the RAC's comments into the public draft as possible.
- Ecosystem, wetlands, and environmental strategies from Proposition 50, as well as ecosystem preservation, will be added back into the process.
- The regional priorities section will be revised for clarity and diagrams will be added.
- Comments from RAC Meetings 6-8 and written comments received will be addressed in the public draft release.
- Detailed definition of sustainability and proposed criteria for measuring sustainability will be emailed to the RAC by Linda Fluornoy.
- The Plan prioritization process will be updated to better address integration of projects and will incorporate RAC member comments on prioritization.

Review of IRWM Plan Prioritization and Approach to Funding Application Prioritization

Alyson gave a PowerPoint presentation reviewing the plan prioritization process and outlining the funding application prioritization processes.

- Prioritization is a two-step process. First, projects are prioritized at the plan level. Then, the top tier of projects from the plan prioritization is screened, scored and ranked to prioritize projects for specific funding applications.
- Integration, defined consistent with Proposition 50 as inclusion of multiple water management strategies, is the most important factor in plan prioritization. At the Plan level, projects are ranked by the number of water management strategies they incorporate.
- In plan prioritization, all projects remain in the plan in ranked lists.
- Funding application prioritization begins with the projects identified as top priorities through plan prioritization. These projects are screened against pass-fail criteria. Projects passing the pass-fail criteria are then scored objectively against a series of scoring criteria, and are ranked by score. The top 30 projects will be considered with respect to a variety of qualitative criteria by a workgroup comprised of RAC members.
- Projects to be included in the funding application will be developed by the RAC workgroup, and will consist of some subset of those 30 highest ranking projects.
- The proposed RAC workgroup would consist of one member from each of the RWMG agencies (one County representative, one City representative, and one representative from the County Water Authority), one representative from the retail water entities, one representative from natural resources and watersheds, one representative for water quality, and two members at large.

RAC Member Comments and Responses:

- Watershed plans are not referenced at all.
- Multiple partners should be a screening criterion. As part of the integration process, there could be a requirement to bring a minimum number of agencies together to propose a project – which would also achieve multi-benefits.
- Points should be given to projects that are integrated with other projects.
- A section should be added between Sections B and C to discuss each of the watershed management plans. The RWMG will request descriptions about the individual watersheds

and their activities from the watershed groups. There may be differences in the level of detail provided.

- Process should account for (award points) for the size and benefit of the project (ie: acres restored, acre-feet conserved, etc); the bigger the benefit, the more points the project receives.
- The group needs to identify what is important to achieving objectives in the region. Want projects that achieve results, not projects that claim to be doing multiple things.
- At some point we should bring cost-benefit into the discussion. Currently, this is captured as a qualitative criterion for the RAC workgroup to consider.
- Add a factor of how/if the project will directly benefit the watershed.
- Some strategies do not make sense for some hydrologic units and should be removed. The team has requested feedback on which strategies should be removed.
- Just because a project is recommended doesn't mean it is appropriate.
- Degree of benefits vs. dis-benefits should be added as a criterion.
- Established targets should be considered in the prioritization process.
- Relationship or connection of projects to other jurisdictional plans, including State, CDF, and Tribal, should be awarded more points.
- There should be some sort of weighting to push projects to top. *This is an option for prioritization at the funding package level. Currently, the focus is on being transparent, using scoring criteria that can be applied objectively, and then ranking to identify the top 30 projects. Once that group has been identified, other less objective criteria will be decided upon by the RAC workgroup.*
- Would like to see various lists showing where projects drop out of the process.
- RAC should have the ability to go back through the top 30 projects and add an additional two to three projects that dropped out but are important to the region.
- Can projects that are funded come from non-state jurisdictions (i.e. tribal lands)? *If it is tied to another project that is within the region, then it is eligible.*
- Scoring should consider projects that are complementary or detrimental to bordering jurisdictions that have their plans in place.
- Downstream should be reworded to down-current to capture spread of invasive species (seeds) via wind and water to up and down-stream locations.
- RAC workgroup should contain two representatives for natural resources and watersheds, as opposed to the proposed one representative for these interests.

Conclusions/Actions

- The group voted on whether to adopt the RAC workgroup as presented; this vote failed. It was proposed that the RAC workgroup should be modified to include an additional representative from natural resources and watersheds, for a total of two representatives for this area. This vote passed.

Request for Additional Information on Project Proposals

Alyson reiterated that an announcement was sent requesting additional information on projects proposed for inclusion in the IRWMP. The RWMG developed an application form requesting additional information to be used in prioritizing projects, and will be hosting a public meeting on April 25 at 1 PM at the Scripps Ranch Branch Library. At that meeting, the group will walk through every item on the project application form and explain how the information will be used to prioritize projects.

RAC Member Comments and Responses:

- If projects have already been submitted, do proponents need to resubmit? *Proponents are required to resubmit even if they have already submitted information. This is an open call for projects, and new projects can be submitted. Forms need to be submitted by May 9. There will be additional rounds for public submittals in the future, but this is the final opportunity to submit projects for Proposition 50 funding consideration.*
- Sustainability should be a criterion at the plan or funding application level. *Explicit discussion is needed to identify what those criteria should be and how sustainability is being defined.*

Conclusions/Actions

- RAC members should complete project application forms for their projects for consideration in the IRWMP.

Public Comments

Kathy requested a break to allow the public time to comment.

Public Comments:

- At the Watershed Day in the Capitol, one of the speakers indicated that their plan required projects to be integrated by forcing different organizations to write proposals for projects together. Failure to do so would prevent the project from consideration.
- The plan has come a long way, and will provide a significant help in applying for funding. The plan should not exclude any strategies that would make projects more appealing or fundable to Sacramento. If specific required strategies are not addressed in the plan, then the region may become less competitive for funding.