Watershed Planning and Outreach Workgroup Meeting #1
February 2, 2008
2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
County of San Diego
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite P
Watershed Protection Conference Room

Attendance
Sheri McPherson, County of San Diego Department of Public Works (facilitator)
Susan Varty, Olivenhain Municipal Water District
Bill Simmons, San Dieguito River Valley Conservancy
Katherine Weldon, City of Encinitas
Kimberly O’Connell, UC San Diego Environmental Affairs
Todd Snyder, County of San Diego Department of Public Works
Mark Stadler, San Diego County Water Authority
Toby Roy, San Diego County Water Authority
Cathy Pieroni, City of San Diego Water Department
Rosalyn Stewart, RMC Water and Environment

Welcome and Introductions
Ms. Sheri McPherson welcomed everyone to the meeting. Ms. McPherson will serve as facilitator until a Workgroup chair is elected. Introductions were made around the room.

Workgroup Objectives
Ms. McPherson reviewed the Workgroup’s ground rules, the definition of consensus (agreement by 2/3 of all Workgroup members present), and the meeting agenda. Workgroup agendas will be based on progress toward the objectives/deliverables. The agenda for an upcoming meeting will be discussed at the previous meeting and distributed in draft form to all Workgroup members one week prior for comments/suggestions.

Ms. McPherson provided a brief overview of the proposed Workgroup objectives.
1. Develop guidance on how watershed groups can identify competitive multi-benefit projects.
   Such guidance may address: identification of projects eligible for Props 84/1E funding; appropriate integration of multiple projects; prioritization of projects within a watershed; and outreach/partnership with water, wastewater, and storm water agencies.
2. Develop a strategy for outreach/coordination with watershed groups to encourage submittal of integrated multi-benefit projects for the Props 84/1E funding cycles.
3. Identify critical water supply and water quality needs for disadvantaged communities (DACs) within the region’s watersheds. Consider how the watershed groups may support and address these critical needs.

4. Develop a strategy for outreach/coordination with DACs to encourage submittal of multi-benefit projects for the Props 84/1E funding cycles that address critical needs.

A discussion was begun regarding watershed governance. Ms. Sue Varty felt that the watersheds should be the focal point of where projects should originate. Each watershed should have some form of organization. That watershed organization would feed into a Hydrologic Unit organization, which in turn would feed into a Countywide Watershed Council. Projects would start at the watershed level with local participation, outreach, and DAC involvement. Projects would be submitted to the Hydrologic Unit organization, where they could be integrated with similar projects. At that stage, cities, water agencies, and sewer districts would become involved to ensure solid integration of strategies. At the Countywide Watershed Council level, the SDCWA and County would become involved. The advantage of this system would be local buy-in, grassroots efforts, and much more integration of projects before submission to the IRWM Program. During Prop 50 project solicitation, the IRWM Program received 160 projects and awarded 19 of them. The IRWM Program was tasked with putting like projects together. If they receive 1,600 for the Prop 84 round, this might be more difficult to do. The disadvantage of this system is that not all watersheds have formal or organized groups yet.

Workgroup comments and suggestions:

- Concern about how to integrate watershed planning into IRWM, because San Diego regional planning not based on the watershed concept.
- Need to identify a common goal during outreach to watershed groups and disadvantaged communities (DACs) – “Improving our watersheds”.
- San Diego region has only three strong watershed groups. How will we address emerging watersheds vs organized watersheds?
- Outreach to emerging watershed groups can identify Prop 84/1E carrot – “We can help you get money for water resources projects if you get organized.”
- Suggestion to encourage more coordination between watershed groups, cities and county, and water/wastewater agencies.
- Long-range vision would be to facilitate a coalition of watershed groups within each of San Diego’s 11 watersheds, then host a countywide coalition of watershed representatives.
- Concern that emerging watersheds will not have adequate resources to pull together project application forms for the next funding round.
- Suggestion to revisit/review the policy proposal developed by Rob Hutsel.

Disadvantaged Communities

Ms. McPherson reviewed the definition of DACs from the IRWM Program (80% of statewide median household income) and mapping/analysis based on Census tracts. Workgroup comments and suggestions:
• There was some confusion about the link between watershed planning and DACs. Because watershed groups are often grass-roots efforts, there is a sense that they are more in tune with DACs and their needs.

• One of the watershed group representatives indicated that his group does not have significant contact with DACs.

• Region should use standardized criteria for defining and identifying DACs.

• How will DAC benefits be assessed? What criteria will be used for ranking projects?

• Should IRWM Program conduct broad DACs outreach throughout the Region or develop a more strategic focus for DACs outreach?

Watershed Outreach and Coordination Strategy

Ms. McPherson then invited discussion of potential outreach methods. Workgroup comments and suggestions:

• Presentations and brainstorming for project ideas at Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program (WURMP) meetings.

• Prepare a Road Show on the IRWM project guidance (Objective #1). Convene a public meeting in each watershed of watershed groups, cities/counties, and agencies to present the Road Show. RWMG will work with RMC to propose an approach and timeline for developing Road Show materials.

• Approach Rural Community Assistance Corporation (RCAC), State Department of Public Health (DPH), and County Department of Environmental Health (DEH) for a list of rural mutual water companies and other organizations that may be targeted for outreach.

• Distribute the IRWM Program banner to link RAC member websites to the IRWM website.

• Announcements on Project Clean Water website.

Action Items

Ms. McPherson suggested that the chair be elected at the next Workgroup meeting, when all members are present. Ms. McPherson reviewed the action items from today’s meeting:

• RMC/Rosalyn Stewart to prepare crosswalk (list and maps) of watershed groups, cities, and water/wastewater agencies in each watershed.

• SDCWA/Mark Stadler to identify specific contacts for member agencies in each watershed.

• SDCWA/Mark Stadler to contact RCAC and Rural Water Association to discuss DAC outreach and obtain information on critical water supply and water needs of DACs in region.

• County/Sheri McPherson to contact County DEH to discuss DAC outreach and obtain information on critical water supply and water needs of DACs in region.

• County/Todd Snyder to distribute email to WURMP group to solicit information on critical water supply and water quality needs of DACs.
• RMC/Rosalyn Stewart to schedule next Workgroup meeting in approximately 1 month.

Ms. Toby Roy reviewed items identified for the next Workgroup meeting agenda:
1. Elect Workgroup chair and alternate.
2. Review policy proposal developed by Rob Hutsel.
3. Discuss critical water supply and water quality needs of DACs.
4. Discuss identified organizations/agencies and contacts for each watershed.
5. Brainstorm outreach strategies for 3 levels of watershed groups: emerging, organized, and mature.