Priorities & Metrics Workgroup
Meeting No. 2

March 23, 2012 ○ 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
County of San Diego Operations Center
5570 Overland Avenue, San Diego, CA 92123

Draft Notes

Action items and responses to comments are presented in italics

Attendees:

Mark Stadler, SDCWA	Travis Pritchard, San Diego CoastKeeper
Dana Friehauf, SDCWA	Robert Davis, Parsons Brinckerhoff
Sheri McPherson, County of SD	Julia Chunn-Heer, Surfrider San Diego
Lynne Baker, San Dieguito Conservancy	Mark Umphres, Helix Water District
Joey Randall, Olivenhain Municipal Water District	Kathy Caldwell, RMC
Dennis Bowling, Floodplain Management Association	Crystal Mohr, RMC
George Adrian, City of San Diego	Lewis Michaelson, Katz & Associates
Rob Hutsel, San Diego River Park Foundation	

1. **Welcome and Introductions**

   Lewis Michaelson welcomed the group, who did self-introductions.

2. **Recap of Previous Meeting and Review of Notes**

   Lewis Michaelson provided an overview of the previous meeting, and the group reviewed the notes. There was a motion and a second, and the group voted by consensus to accept the meeting notes.

3. **Meeting No. 2 Objectives:**

   Lewis Michaelson provided an overview of the current meeting objectives, including:

   - Review outcomes of IRWM Summit
   - Consider revisions to objectives
   - Discuss metrics and measuring progress for achieving objectives

- Provide preliminary direction on prioritization of objectives and integration strategy for Round 2 and Round 3 or Proposition 84 Implementation Grant funding

4. **IRWM Summit – Review Outcomes**
   - Lewis Michaelson began by asking the group if those in attendance had any takeaways from the Summit that they would like to share. The following are takeaways provided by the group:
     - In general the Summit was well-attended, with many attendees that are not generally present for IRWM-related events (such as RAC meetings).
     - The keynote speakers were all on-point and well done. It was especially nice to have new speakers and attendees for these presentations.
     - The Summit provided a good opportunity for networking and mingling with individuals interested in all aspects of water planning.
     - It was interesting to hear Fran Spivy-Weber of the State Water Resources Control Board speak about other funding opportunities and what other regions are doing to leverage future IRWM funds.
   - Lewis Michaelson then provided an overview presentation to the group that discussed overall attendance of the Summit, as well as the results from the breakout group exercise where attendees were asked to discuss regional conflicts, discuss new objectives, and complete a prioritization exercise for existing objectives.

5. **Discuss Outcomes and Decide on Necessary Revisions to Objectives**

   Kathy Caldwell provided an overview of IRWM objectives as defined by DWR, including requirements for objectives. Lewis Michaelson then facilitated a conversation with the workgroup to discuss the existing objectives, the results of the Summit, and decide on necessary revisions to the objectives. Below is a summary of the conversation that occurred with respect to revising the IRWM objectives:

   - Would like to add climate change. This is particularly important, because it may set the region up for other funding sources such as mitigation banking offsets.
   - Would like the climate change objective to include a component that speaks to the water-energy nexus associated with various water supplies, as well as how climate change may impact water supply.
   - Think it is important to include an aspect of integration or coordinated planning efforts. We need to
   - Need to keep in mind that some objectives (such as that discussed above regarding integration and the first 3 existing objectives) may be IRWM program objectives rather than objectives that speak to IRWM projects. There is a clear distinction between these two types of objectives.
     - Note: more than one workgroup member expressed support for differentiated project vs. program-level objectives.
   - Need to keep in mind how the objectives relate to the goals. Can potentially elevate some objectives (perhaps program objectives) to the goal-level.

- We also need to keep in mind that in the 2007 IRWM Plan there were short-term and long-term planning priorities associated with the goals and objectives. We may need to revise these as well.
- The current objective (Objective F) relating to flooding really does not incorporate integrated flood management.
- Would like to keep in mind that although the DWR Guidelines are necessary to follow, ultimately this plan is about our region. We want it to speak to our region and not be tied to DWR requirements alone.
- Perhaps add an objective that is more specific than just climate change – perhaps something related to improving energy efficiency and reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.
  - Also need to realize that there is a distinction between mitigation for GHG emissions to reduce climate change and adaptation to climate change.
- Need to include water use efficiency, which is not currently reflected in any of the objectives.
- The objectives do not encompass watershed health. In general there is something missing regarding a connection between water supply and watershed protection.
  - Suggest potentially elevating this issue to the goal-level. Our region is unique in that it contains so many distinct watersheds that in many ways have a variety of individual issues. Could potentially expand Goal 3 to include watersheds.
- There needs to be more emphasis on public education and outreach (this is also demonstrated in the outcomes from the Summit).
  - Current Objective A already speaks to this.
  - Disagree – Objective A speaks to maximizing stakeholder involvement, which is not the same as education and outreach.
- Recommend getting rid of Objective I as an objective, but not as an issue. We could move metrics associated with Objective I to other objectives.
  - Disagree – recreation is an important beneficial use, and should remain as an objective. Also, it gives the issue of recreation equal importance to include it is a standalone objective rather than incorporating it into the other objectives.
- Need to include health and safety – this was also an important issue expressed by Summit attendees.

The group then went back through the discussion outlined above to compile and reach consensus on new and revised objectives. Below is an overview of that discussion:

- Revise Goal 3 as follows: Protect and enhance our <u>watersheds and </u>natural resources.
  - Add watershed-based targets to many of the objectives to reflect the inclusion of watersheds within the goals.
- Include an objective relating to climate change.
  - Draft language – "Effectively address the adaptation and/or mitigation for climate change in water resource management."

- Modify Objective F, associated metrics, and the description for Objective F to include integrated flood management and incorporate targets associated with watershed health.
    - *Dennis Bowling volunteered to provide draft language for a modified version of Objective F.*
- Modify Objective D to include water use efficiency.
    - Draft revision – Develop and maintain a diverse mix of water resources <u>and encourage their efficient use.</u>
    - Need to add new metrics related to water use efficiency.
- Modify Objective F as follows: Reduce the negative effects on waterways and watershed health caused by ~~hydromodification and~~ flooding.
- Add education to Objective A with more emphasis on public education and outreach to connect directly with Goal 4.
- Add health and safety to Objective G.
- Remove Objective I and incorporate the targets elsewhere.
    - NOTE: consensus was not reached on this recommendation.

The group decided that in generally, they were comfortable with the recommendations outlined above, with the exception of the removal of Objective I, which was not agreed upon. The group will be sent a revised version of potential changes and additions to the goals and objectives, and will be responsible for coming up with ideas regarding metrics and targets for each objective before the next workgroup meeting.

6. **Determine if/how to Prioritize Objectives**

The Workgroup was then asked to discuss the potential prioritization of objectives. Kathy Caldwell provided an overview of the pros and cons of prioritization, as well as potential prioritization options such as tiering. Below is an overview of that discussion:

- The issue is limited resources. If we prioritize objectives, we will be setting up prioritization of projects, which will eliminate some projects. This is a problem.
- The truth is that there are always more projects than we have money for, and therefore prioritization is essential. We have to do this already during project selection, so it makes sense to prioritize ahead of time to streamline that future process.
- In some ways it makes sense for efficiency purposes to streamline upfront if prioritization will naturally occur later on.
- There are merits on both sides. The reality is that if we start prioritizing now and potentially eliminating projects, we will lose support for the overall program.
- There are also issues if our priorities change in the future. If we set the prioritization process up to be flexible, then really there is no point to doing it now. Conversely, if it is set up to be rigid, there may be issues if the priorities change.
- However, looking at this from the front end, prioritization will potentially allow project sponsors to create projects that meet our objectives from the start.

- It is potentially important to let folks know what will and will not be competitive up front. This allows them to have a better idea of what to include in potential projects.
- It would be preferable to instead of prioritizing, having strong targets. This will allow us to know for sure if projects are able to meet the objectives when the project prioritization process happens later on.
- If we prioritize now, would we reduce the number of projects that apply for funding? If so, that would hurt the overall plan.

Following the discussion presented above, workgroup members voted on the idea that they would prefer not to prioritize the objectives. Below are the voting results using the workgroup's pre-determined levels of consensus (voting results in **bold**):

1. I can say an unqualified 'yes' to the decision. I am satisfied that the decision is an expression of wisdom of the group.
   i. **Number of votes: 0**
2. I find the decision perfectly acceptable. It is the best of the real options we have available to us.
   i. **Number of votes: 9**
3. I can live with the decision. However, I'm not especially enthusiastic about it.
   i. **Number of votes: 1**
4. I do not fully agree with the decision and need to register my view about it. However, I do not choose to block the decision and will stand aside. I am willing to support the decision because I trust the wisdom of the group.
   i. **Number of votes: 1**
5. I do not agree with the decision and feel the need to block the decision being accepted as consensus.
   i. **Number of votes: 0**
6. I feel that we have no clear sense of unity in the group. We need to do more work before consensus can be achieved.
   i. **Number of votes: 1**

In sum, the group voted not to prioritize objectives for now, but to still explore the idea of categorization or differentiation between programmatic and project-level objectives.

7. Discuss Metrics and Measuring Progress for Achieving Objectives

Kathy Caldwell provided an overview of metrics, noting that DWR requires that all objectives must be either qualitatively or quantitatively measurable.

The group decided that this process is not useful until objectives have been solidified. Please refer to the discussion above regarding Agenda Item 5, explaining that the group will consider potential metrics for discussion prior to the next workgroup meeting.

8. Public Comments

No members of the public were present at this Workgroup meeting.

9. Summary and Action Items

The group will continue their discussion at the next meeting, May 16, 2012. Due to time constraints experienced at this meeting, the following meeting will be three hours long, from 9 a.m. to 12 p.m.