



**Regional Advisory Council
Meeting #8 Notes**

June 12, 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
Rick Alexander on behalf of Dennis Bostad, Sweetwater Authority
Meleah Ashford, Consultant to the City of Encinitas
Michael Bardin, Santa Fe Irrigation District
Chris Basilevac, The Nature Conservancy
Michael Connolly, Campo Kumeyaay Nation
Neal Brown, Padres Dam Municipal Water District
Kathleen Flannery, County of San Diego
Linda Flournoy, Sustainability Consultant
Karen Franz, San Diego CoastKeeper
Doug Gibson, San Elijo Lagoon Conservancy
Jason Giessow on behalf of Judy Mitchell, Mission Resources Conservation District
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
Richard Pyle, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce
Marsi Steirer, City of San Diego
Mike Thornton, San Elijo Joint Powers Authority
Shelby Tucker, San Diego Association of Governments
Mark Weston, Helix Water District
Ken Weinberg, San Diego County Water Authority
T. Whitaker on behalf of Dr. Richard Wright, Department of Geography, San Diego State University
Mark Umphres, Helix Water District
Susan Varty, Olivenhain Municipal Water District

Attendance – RWMG Staff

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

Jon Van Rhyn, County of San Diego

Attendance – Interested Parties to the RAC

Grace Chan, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
Kelly Hendrickson, San Diego Zoological Society
Brett Kawakami, RMC Water and Environment
Alyson Watson, RMC Water & Environment
Michael Welch, Welch Consulting
Meena Westford, U.S. Department of Interior Bureau of Reclamation

Attendance – Public

None

Introductions

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

Public Draft IRWMP

Ms. Flannery announced that the Public Draft San Diego IRWM Plan was now available on the internet. She instructed RAC members to contact Ms. Dana Frieauf if hardcopies are desired. Public announcements are being made to announce the availability of the Public Draft IRWM Plan. A media advisory was issued and the North County Times will publish a notification of the public availability of the Public Draft IRWM Plan. The public comment period closes July 13th, which allows a 30 day public review period as required by the Proposition 50 Guidelines.

Ms. Flannery acknowledged the efforts of Rob Hutsel, Craig Adams, Karen Franz and Doug Gibson in reviewing local watershed management plans for the IRWM Plan.

Mr. Mark Stadler reviewed the tentative schedule for the IRWM Plan. July 13 is the end of the public comment period and the SDCWA Board will adopt the Plan on July 26. Mark then described the RAC workgroup that will review a shortlist of Tier 1 projects and provide recommendations to the RAC on projects to include in the Round 2 Prop 50 funding application. Mark stated that the workgroup will narrow the list down to say, five to six projects for which funding will be pursued. The workgroup will bring this proposed list back to the RAC for acceptance. The workgroup will consist of members who will be selected for their expertise in specific areas.

RAC Member Comments and Responses:

- The date for the RAC meeting scheduled for September 11 should be changed, if possible, because of the significance of that date. *The meeting will be rescheduled for another day, if possible.*
- Five or six projects seems like a small number of projects to be funded. It would be more desirable to fund a larger number of projects at a lesser degree, than a smaller number of projects at a higher degree. *The number of five to six projects was only used for illustrative purposes. The actual number of projects that will be proposed for funding has not been determined and will be left to the discretion of the RAC workgroup. Ground guidelines will be provided to the workgroup.*

- How would the components of institutional structure be determined? *This can be found in the Public Review Draft. A number of potential structure models have been identified. The RWMG will determine how to present the information to the RAC.*
- Will you share with how the Tier 1 projects were determined? *The Tier 1 projects were determined as the top 50th percentile of projects based on the score obtained from criteria that the RAC agreed upon. Scorecards have been provided in Appendix 7 that show how the scores were determined for each project. We are requesting that proponents review their project scores and provide feedback.*
- How can we provide feedback on the projects? *Please provide comments in written form. There is a comment form on the website. Feedback can also be provided at the public workshop for project proponents. If you have any questions, contact Ms. Alyson Watson or Mr. Stadler.*
- The comment form was in Excel format, which was difficult to use. Is it ok to convert this to Word format? *Yes.*
- Are there any provisions for bundling of projects? Many projects in the database were similar. It will be a better solution to fund many agencies, with one agency taking lead. *Yes, this will be left to the project proponents to initiate. This point can be made at the project workshop at the public meeting.*
- Will there be another project submission process? *There will be an opportunity to submit public comments and an avenue provided to modify projects. We recognize that there may be errors and encourage you to submit comments. Projects will be rescored based on comments, although this will not be incorporated into the August 1st version of the Plan. The rescored Tier 1 list will be used as the potential pool of projects for the project workgroup.*
- There are number of projects submitted for Canyon Preserve, which could be good candidates for project bundling. Water conservation projects could also present bundling opportunities.

Conclusions/Actions

The date for the September 11 RAC meeting will be changed, if possible. Comments on the IRWM Plan and projects should be provided in written form by July 13th.

Review of Short- and Long-Term Priorities

Ms. Alyson Watson reviewed the short- and long-term priorities for the region. The IRWM Plan standards require that short- and long-term implementation priorities and the process for determining those priorities be identified, in addition to the process for modifying priorities based on regional changes. Short-term priorities are intended to address immediate areas of need to ensure that regional planning can continue; as such, short-term implementation priorities will be accomplished within a 3-5 year timeframe. The short term priorities are:

1. Implement priority projects and programs that support the Region's IRWM goals and objectives.
2. Formally establish a long-term institutional structure to guide the ongoing development and implementation of the San Diego IRWM Plan.
3. Implement and update (as needed) a Public Outreach Plan that ensures key stakeholders and affected parties are informed and engaged in IRWM planning and implementation.

4. Establish a regional, web-based data management system for sharing, disseminating and supporting the analysis of water management data and information.
5. Complete a needs assessment and develop recommendations for addressing existing deficiencies in the technical and scientific foundation of San Diego Basin Plan beneficial uses and water quality objectives.
6. Complete an updated assessment of local water management plans to ensure effective and upfront input from these plans during all phases of IRWM planning and implementation. Where planning deficiencies are identified, address these deficiencies as part of the IRWMP update process.
7. Revise the IRWM Plan and publish the Second Edition of the San Diego IRWM Plan.

For each short term priority, an action plan has been established that includes a list of tasks necessary to fully address the priority and a schedule.

The long-term implementation priorities are:

1. Maintain an effective institutional structure.
2. Maintain public involvement.
3. Achieve goals and objectives.

Project prioritization is a separate process that identifies integrated projects that are consistent with the regional objectives.

RAC Member Comments and Responses:

- What is the definition of environmental justice? *An environmental justice community is a community that is negatively impacted in a disproportionate manner by an environmental condition or project.*
- Have you given any thought as how you would approach the needs assessment for the Basin Plan? *We need to develop a clear plan. The RAC is a regional forum that could be leveraged to gain the RWQCB's attention. We have found that recommendations alone are not enough to move the RWQCB to act. Last time, our recommendations were not implemented due to limited RWQCB resources; this time, we need to engage the RWQCB to ensure that our recommendations are prioritized..*
- We should become involved in the Basin Plan Triennial Review and develop a partnership with the RWQCB. The RAC has political clout that could be used to influence the Basin Planning process.
- Will Prop 50 provide funding support for activities for the Basin Plan needs assessment? *Prop 50 will not, however Prop 84 may provide funds for planning.*
- The Region should be creative in Prop 50 and try to get \$100 - \$200K to support planning activities.
- The institutional structure should also consider potential funding mechanisms.
- Additional attention should be given to coordination with watersheds. The IRWM planning process should be used to help all watersheds develop management plans. *Short-term priority #6 involves furthering planning at the watershed-level, particularly for those watersheds that currently lack watershed plans.*

- If you use functional area workgroups to complete an updated assessment of local water management plans, there may be little overlap in their planning. For instance, for water supply, you may have five water agencies with different service areas. Whereas, if you use watershed groups, they may be able to work together better. *The idea is that functional areas, such as wastewater treatment, may have more issues in common and can identify similar planning opportunities and commonalities.*
- Watershed planning should be a functional area. *Watershed planning will be a functional area.*
- We are creating our own process in parallel to the RWQCB process. How can you influence the RWQCB process? For instance, the RWQCB Triennial review? *We can make sure that the RAC schedules are aligned with the RWQCB external schedules. Also, forming partnerships will assist in getting buy-in from the RWQCB.*
- One strategy to influence the RWQCB is to include them as stakeholders, to avoid any surprises stemming from IRWM planning. Efforts should be made to reach out to the RWQCB as part of the Public Outreach Plan, and this should occur sooner than later.
- We need to focus on environmental issues and watersheds. Integration to me means considering environmental issues in conjunction with functional areas. We should also strive to minimize the number of meetings we are planning. This would also tie into the long-term institutional structure – how do you disseminate information so that the number of meetings can be minimized?
- The watershed-centric approach may not work for all scenarios, but one can envision a possible scenario where a water agency may wish to approach the RWQCB with a project or action that may adversely impact water quality. In this case, it would be advantageous to call on the support of other partners in the watershed.
- We may want to conduct the review of local water management plans in groups. First, each functional group focuses only on meeting their needs and meet only within their watershed. This could then be followed by meetings at the regional level.

Conclusions/Actions

The concept of reviewing local water management plans by functional groups within a watershed and then across watersheds at the regional level will be considered as this short-term priority is implemented.

Updates

Mr. Jeff Pasek gave an update on the Final Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) for Round 2. Comments were made to DWR by the three agencies of the RWMG. The web address to the PSP will be emailed and added to the Project Clean Water website.

The relationship between Integrated Coastal Water Management Plans (ICWMs) and the IRWM have changed in the final PSP. There are 6 ICWMs in the state, and one is located in the San Diego Region, focusing on the La Jolla Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS). Since the ICWM is within the San Diego IRWM boundaries, its projects were included in the IRWM Plan.

Ms. Cathy Pieroni provided an update on the California Water Plan 2009. The advisory committee has been modified since the previous update to achieve more of a regional focus, and it does not include any water agencies. There will be a series of workshops on the Water Plan from June

through August. Ms. Pieroni will be on the design team and will be responsible for setting up the San Diego meeting.

Karen Franz will be coordinating the San Diego Watershed Data Management Summit to be held on June 20, 2007 at the San Diego Foundation. The meeting is being convened by San Diego Coastkeeper to identify strategies for improving access to and interpretation of information related to watershed management.

RAC Member Comments and Responses:

- How many projects were identified that fall under both IRWM and ICWM funding? *This is not known at this time.*
- My understanding is that ICWM representatives were informed that the amount of money in Prop 50 that had been promised to coastal plans had been taken away – is that true? *The guidelines do not place any special limits on the money that ICWMs can receive; like IRWMs, they are limited to a maximum funding request of \$25M. The La Jolla Shores ICWM decided not to compete independently for Prop 50 funding and are participating in this round of Prop 50 solely through the San Diego IRWM Plan.*

Conclusions/Actions

Information on upcoming California Water Plan 2009 meetings will be emailed to the RAC.

Future Agenda Items

For future meetings, a proposal was made to set aside 15 minutes for policy presentations given by experts to provide education and opportunities for cross pollination. Some potential topics include integrated planning, the La Jolla ASBS, water recycling, etc. These presentations will be in addition to regular calendar items.

On July 10, the RAC will form the workgroup responsible for developing the funding application package. The workgroup will consist of 9 members as follows: 1 representative from each of the RWMG agencies, 1 representative of retail water agencies, 2 representatives of natural resources and watersheds interests, 1 representative of water quality, and 2 at large member representatives. The RWMG will develop ground rules (e.g. members can't vote on own projects). RAC members were asked to consider who they would like to nominate for the workgroup.

RAC Member Comments and Responses:

- A discussion should be held about the long-term mission of the RAC beyond the IRWM Plan.
- Metrics should be discussed.
- Agencies can identify potential workgroup nominees from their own agency that have expertise – the key is that they be somewhat removed from the IRWM planning process
- What is the estimated time commitment for workgroup members? *Members should be willing to commit to weekly half-day meetings for approximately one month (August). The workgroup will be provided with a set of initial projects that will number less than the current 80 Tier 1 projects.*
- The project evaluation does not consider quantitative benefits. If a Prop 50 application is submitted without quantified benefits, it will not pass. Many of the projects that received high scores list a large number of benefits, but these are not quantified. A project may

touch upon a number of benefits, but the question is how much will it actually deliver? The workgroup will need quantitative savings (AFY water savings, habitat acreage, etc.). *There is information on the project that can be used to develop metrics that the workgroup will use. The RCM team includes an economist to assist in converting these quantified benefits to financial benefits.*

- The workgroup should have all the information necessary to determine maximum benefits with minimal costs. The grant application a couple of years ago did not have this information. We need to go to project proponents to get this information.
- Where did the economist come from? This is the first time we have heard of this. It is relatively straightforward to do economic analysis on water supply, but more difficult for habitat and restoration. *The RMC team includes Bob Raucher, a well-respected economist and founder of Stratus Consulting. Bob and his team are experienced in preparing IRWM grant applications. He will be invited to a RAC meeting to provide more insight in how the economic project benefits will be developed.*
- When will the revised Tier 1 list of projects be available? *The Tier 1 list will be updated before August 1st. July 13 is the deadline for comments.*
- Will you consider bundling as you are going through evaluation process? *We have already started identifying and flagging projects that could be bundled and will suggest that the project proponents coordinate.*
- What is the role that the RWMG and the consultant will have in the workgroup? *The workgroup will perform the project selection process and determine the project package for funding with the guidelines that they receive. The workgroup will then bring the package back to the RAC. The RWMG is developing the workgroup guidelines with assistance from the consultant team. These guidelines will be presented to the RAC for approval. The consultant team will assist the workgroup in understanding the Prop 50 guidelines and what will constitute a competitive proposal.*

Conclusions/Actions

The RAC will identify workgroup nominees. The draft workgroup guidelines are under development and will be provided to the RAC.

The next RAC meeting will be held July 10 from 9 -11:30 AM.

Public Comments

No public comments were received.