



## **Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) Meeting #81**

June 5, 2019  
9:00 am – 11:30 am

**San Diego County Water Authority  
Board Room  
4677 Overland Ave., San Diego CA 92123  
(858) 522-6600**

### **NOTES**

#### **Attendance**

---

##### **RAC Members**

Richard Whipple, County of San Diego (chair)  
Ann Van Leer, Escondido Creek Conservancy  
Bill Hunter, Santa Fe Irrigation District  
Brook Sarson, San Diego Sustainable Living Institute  
Eric La Chappa, La Posta Band of Mission Indians  
Erica Pinto, Jamul Indian Village of California  
Greg Thomas, Rincon del Diablo Municipal Water District  
Jennifer Hazard, Rural Community Assistance Corporation  
Joel San Juan and alternate Janice Reynoso, Alter Terra  
John Flores and alternate Rob Roy, San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians  
Jonathan Witt, San Diego County Board of Education  
Justin Gamble, City of Oceanside  
Mark Stadler for Kelley Gage, San Diego County Water Authority  
Kimberly O'Connell, University of California – San Diego Clean Water Utility  
Joseph Randall for Kimberly Thorner, Olivenhain Municipal Water District  
Alex Yescas for Mark Seits, Floodplain Management Association  
Karina Danek for John Helminski, City of San Diego  
Courtney Provo for Lance Andersen, Mission Resource Conservation District  
Alex Yescas for Mark Seits, Floodplain Management Association  
S. Wayne Rosenbaum for Michael McSweeney, Building Industry Association  
Michelle Berens, Helix Water District  
Chris Trees for Mike Thornton, San Elijo Joint Powers Authority  
Patrick McDonough, San Diego Coastkeeper  
Phil Pryde and alternate Rob Hutsel, San Diego River Park Foundation

Robyn Badger and alternate Kelly Craig, Zoological Society of San Diego  
Ron Mosher and alternate Erick Del Bosque, Sweetwater Authority  
Sandra Jacobson, California Trout  
Sarah Pierce, San Diego Association of Governments  
Seval Sven, Padre Dam Municipal Water District  
Beth Gentry for Yazmin Arellano, City of El Cajon

**RAC Non-Voting Members**

Leslie Cleveland for Jack Simes, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation

**RWVG Staff and Consultants**

Elizabeth Lovsted, San Diego County Water Authority  
Loisa Burton, San Diego County Water Authority  
Nicole Poletto, Woodard & Curran  
Roselyn Prickett, Woodard & Curran  
Ruth de la Rosa, County of San Diego  
Sally Johnson, Woodard & Curran

**Interested Parties to the RAC**

Aaron Cook, Fallbrook Public Utilities District  
Andrew Funk, City of San Diego  
Anne Bamford, Industrial Environmental Association  
Bailey Durant, Viejas Tribal Government  
Carlos Michelin, San Diego County Water Authority  
Catherine Rom, City of San Diego  
Christopher Paulino, Viejas Tribal Government  
Claudia Estupinan, City of Chula Vista  
Daniel DuGal, Viejas Tribal Government  
David Wells, City of San Diego  
Emma Havstad, River Partners  
Frank Rivera, City of Chula Vista  
Jon Nottage, City of Vista  
Katherine Sharp, Wood PLC  
Katie Payne, Enthalpy Analytical  
Khadija Wade, City of San Diego  
Kyrsten Burr, Hoch Consulting  
Rob Roy, La Jolla Band of Indians  
Sarah Brower, City of San Diego  
Senan Kachi, City of El Cajon  
Sylvia Solis Daniels, City of Vista

**Welcome and Introductions**

---

Mr. Richard Whipple, County of San Diego, welcomed everyone to the meeting and introductions were made around the room.

## **Project Completion Report**

---

Scott Johnson, City of Santee presented the Project Completion Report for the Pilot Concrete Channel Infiltration Project. This project was awarded funding in IRWM Prop 84, Round 1 in 2011 and was completed in November 2017. Project goals are to develop a new type of BMP, reduce dry weather flows, reduce pollutants in dry weather flows, promote infiltration, and maintain flood control capacity.

The project restored a three-mile concrete channel near the confluence of the San Diego River. This channel is considered one of the major outfalls of the San Diego River because it carries approximately 340 acres of the watershed within the city and 20% of dry-weather flows. Walker Preserve in Santee used to be a sand mine. There is 50-55 feet of sand beneath the channel, making it a great location to add infiltration to the concrete channel. The location of the infiltration panels is about 150 feet from the outfall of the San Diego River.

The total project was \$325,900, though actual costs are higher; the IRWM Project award was approximately \$250,000. The project removed existing concrete, dug 2.5 feet into the subgrade, sand layer and added filter fabric: 9-54" per hour infiltration rate with a safety factor of 3, approximately 3-17" per hour, above the 0.5" per hour requirement. The infiltration strips in the channel were installed without affecting rest of the channel. As water comes down the channel it disappears into the infiltration strips, preventing "summertime slobber" from getting to the San Diego River. Dry weather flows are intercepted, reducing the amount of pollutants entering the San Diego River from the developed watershed.

### Questions/Comments:

- Have you had any experiences with O&M? Do you have a way to measure the quality of the water that is infiltrating?
  - The water was tested in advance as part of a dry weather program. The amount of sand and depth to groundwater naturally filters the water before it gets to the groundwater, and additional filters are added as part of the project. With this system in place, there should not be any issues with introducing pollutants into the groundwater.

## **San Diego Basin Study**

---

Leslie Cleveland, Bureau of Reclamation and Sarah Brower, City of San Diego provided an update on the San Diego Basin Study, which has been ongoing for the last six to eight years. The objectives of the Study are to determine how climate change will impact the water supply system and develop structural and non-structural adaptation strategies to manage climate change impacts. The Study has completed Tasks 2.1-2.4 and is now at the end of the final step, 2.5: Economic Analysis and Trade-Off Opportunities.

In May 2019, the Study became available for a second round of review. This was in response to feedback received on the first draft including the need to change how figures and captures were displayed in addition to an update on the GIS analysis/modeling for 120 projects in the Region to check calculations.

The Study also added a customized Trade-Off Analysis Tool to help users work through some of the challenges and complex information surrounding climate change. Users can evaluate what the options are moving forward and what the pros and cons of those options are. Users can customize the

spreadsheet tool and complete trade-off priorities for their organization based on personalized priorities weights.

Task 1.5 and Summary will be presented at the August RAC presentation. The Summary report is a synthesis of previously published reports.

If you'd like to provide feedback for the Trade-Off Analysis tool or the completed study, please do so as soon as possible. Feedback can be sent to: Allison Danner Odell ([aodell@usbr.gov](mailto:aodell@usbr.gov)), Leslie Cleveland ([lcleveland@usbr.gov](mailto:lcleveland@usbr.gov)), Sarah Brower ([sbrower@sandiego.gov](mailto:sbrower@sandiego.gov)), and Steve Piper ([spiper@usbr.gov](mailto:spiper@usbr.gov)).

### **Proposition 1, Round 1**

---

Mark Stadler, SDCWA, provided an overview of the current Prop 1, Round 1 project solicitation. There is \$19.9 million available for the San Diego Funding Area, at least \$1.7 million of which is reserved for Disadvantaged Communities (DACs). \$15.4 million is reserved for the San Diego IRWM Region. There is a 50% funding match required and a funding match waiver available for projects that benefit DACs and Economically Distressed Areas (EDA). Reimbursement costs are eligible if incurred after Final Grant Award, while costs incurred after January 1, 2015 are eligible as funding match.

DWR released the Draft Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) in October 2018 and the San Diego IRWM Program conducted a call for projects in Fall 2018. DWR delayed the release of the Final PSP until April 2019, changes to which lead to re-opening the San Diego IRWM Region's Call for Projects in May 2019. The number of submitted projects increased from 14 to 18 during the second Call for Projects. One project submitted during the first Call for Projects withdrew their application prior to the close of the second Call for Projects. The total grant request is \$87 million for the available \$15.4 million of grant funds. At the February 2019 RAC meeting, the RAC recommended to tier the projects into Tier 1 and Tier 2 and to award funding to 4-7 projects. All of the projects ranked in Tier 1 will be automatically considered by the Project Selection Workgroup (PSW). Projects from Tier 2 can be elevated for consideration to Tier 1 if two-thirds of the PSW agrees. Based on the project scores, 11 projects were grouped into Tier 1, while 7 projects were grouped into Tier 2. The recommended project list will be available in August following the completion of the PSW.

The Final PSP included a CEQA and permit deadline extension from 6 months to 12 months after Final Award or prior to agreement execution. DWR was clear that projects without CEQA would be removed from the agreement with the exception for DAC, EDA, and Tribal projects. CEQA costs incurred after Final Award are eligible for reimbursement. CEQA and permits for the projects included in the San Diego IRWM Program's application are tentatively anticipated to have a completion deadline of March 2021. Another key change in the Final PSP was the removal of the Limited Waiver of Sovereign Immunity requirement. DWR will consult with awarded Tribes on a government-to-government basis. Finally, a project is considered DAC if it benefits at least 75% DAC, rather than 100% DAC. Partial cost share waivers are available for DACs and EDAs.

#### Questions/Comments:

- Is removing the Sovereignty waiver retroactive across all rounds?
  - No, it is not retroactive. The waiver is only removed for this round of funding.
- How did we determine if a project meets the 75% DAC requirements?

Visit us at [www.sdirwmp.org](http://www.sdirwmp.org)

- We measure it in a few ways: 1) geographic area and 2) population. The data is mapped in Census tracts and blockgroups.
- 75% of project benefit area or population must be identified as a DAC using the DWR mapping tool in order to qualify as a DAC project.
- If CEQA must be completed by 2021, have we used this criterion to ground truth projects to ensure selected projects will be eligible? This deadline is only 19 months away.
  - No, we did not truth this or incorporate into project scoring.
- Are the requirements in the PSP for DACs related to the IRWM Scoring Criteria?
  - For the scoring, we looked at what the Project proponent said and if the Project is in a DAC.
  - This is a good point. We will provide this data to the PSW during the Selection Process so that the Workgroup knows which projects are eligible for DAC funding according to DWR.
- What does PSP stand for?
  - Proposal Solicitation Package

RAC Discussion on Project Tiering:

- I am concerned that we've not divided Tier 1 and Tier 2 equally. I would highly suggest the PSW only look at the first project. 11 is a lot of projects for the PSW to consider in addition to the few projects that may get pulled up from Tier 2.
  - The division of the Tiers seem to be at a logical breakpoint. Maybe the PSW could divide their workload by looking at more critical deciding factors to decide the hard line between projects.
- These evaluations were done quite subjectively by the third-party evaluator, which may have caused at least a 0.2 in error in project scores. The subjectivity is a good justification for including the first 11 projects in Tier 1 due to the minimal difference in scores. The City has a project in Tier 2. I looked at the narrative of my project against other projects in Tier 1 and believe there is error in how some projects were evaluated against each other.
  - I have to agree; I don't think the third-party scoring was on-point this time. If we had more time, I would like to look at these weighted scores again. I don't think that the third-party took a deep dive into the definitions of each of the scoring criteria or had a very good understanding of the scoring criteria. If any category should be re-examined, it would be the DAC scoring criteria. The third-party evaluator was pretty generous with the points that they gave for DAC benefits for projects that aren't necessarily DACs.
  - After some quick math, it appears that the scores of one of the projects is wrong.
- I agree that 11 projects are a lot for the PSW to review. If we tighten up the scoring, the PSW will review less projects. I don't have a suggestion of where a better break point might be

between Tiers. The scores are based on third-party scoring. If the third-party scoring is updated there may be more distinction among projects for a different breaking point.

- If you wanted to adjust the third-party evaluation and look through the scoring criteria one more time, decide on one thing to elevate. Let's elevate the focus of this funding cycle and run the scores through a different lens. This may help distinguish a different line between the Tiers.
- The purpose of the first cut (Tier 1 vs. Tier 2) is to reduce the workload for the PSW. We could make the third party scoring more robust, but this may not change the workload.
  - I don't want to create more work for the PSW, but I want to make sure projects are scored correctly before they go to the Workgroup.
    - One of the things that the PSW does is verifies project benefits. This includes direct or indirect benefit to DACs. Do the DACs need to be mapped in order to claim the points?
- I do think the third-party scorer does a good job of getting us to the top projects. If culling it down to a more manageable workload is important, that is fine. However, the PSW still looks at all the projects and elevates to a higher level. At this point, we need to let the Workgroup do their job. They will have heavy discussions about all projects and our banter about the numbers will not be as impactful. My recommendation is to stick to the current Tier 1 and 2 breakdown. You could drop it to an even 50% for 9 projects in each Tier, considering that all projects will still be reviewed and discussed in the Workgroup.
  - I agree. At the end of the day, what we came up with is good. Whether you do 11 projects in Tier 1 or 9 projects, it is up to the PSW to dig deeper.
  - I also agree and reiterate what was said before. There is no natural breakpoint for the projects between Tier 1 and 2 before the first 11 projects. This is a natural break and an easy cut-off.
  - I reiterate what was just said. There is no natural breakpoint in the projects of 5-11. The current tiering is a natural break and an easy cut-off.

*Motion to continue with the recommendations from the RWMG and keep Tier 1 and Tier 2 as is. This will be revisited after hearing comments from the public.*

Public Comments:

- City of San Diego Stormwater: Logan Heights Green Street requests the following scores be re-evaluated:
  - Creates or offsets potable water demand
    - The Project includes planting of trees and shrubs and using stormwater as a resource to irrigate those plantings.
- City of San Diego Stormwater: Logan Heights Green Street Project requests the following scores be re-evaluated:
  - Creates or offsets potable water demand



- The Project includes planting of trees and shrubs and using stormwater as a resource to irrigate those plantings.
- Stormwater as a resource
  - The scoring in this category doesn't make sense. Projects only received either a 4 or a 2.
- When scoring projects, there should be a consideration for feasibility and scale. I struggled filling out that part of the application whether it was asking for cubic feet of water, acre-feet, or gallons, and at what cost? There needs to be some sort of assessment or guidance on project feasibility that can help applicants determine a cost-benefit analysis. Some of the benefits can be quantified and some do not. There doesn't seem to be any guidance on how the "bang for the buck" is calculated. It would help me determine if the quantified benefit is worth the money.
  - We will take this into account in the future. The Workgroup takes this into account.
- City of Vista: South Santa Fe Green Streets Project. This project is a multi-phase project. Phase 1 is complete and Phase 2 is under construction. This application is for additional funding under Phase 3, which is 100% designed and shovel ready. CEQA certification has been received and approved. The community has been designated and approved by SWRCB as a severely DAC community, so match amount for Phase 2 has been reduced. There are two existing affordable housing projects along that corridor and one more in progress. The Project aligns with multiple Objectives in the IRWM plan. Multi-benefit for Prop 1 funding. Project is 100% design and shovel-ready. We believe its infrastructure improvements in this corridor will make a regional impact along historical 395 used by vehicles entering neighboring cities. The City requests the following scores be reevaluated:
  - Creates new applied water offsets – re-evaluate and award 1 point rather than the 0.
    - The Project includes a series of photocells and CalSense irrigation system so watering occurs when necessary, reducing potable demand. *Photos of existing conditions of the Green Street and BMPs were passed around.*
  - Enhance infrastructure – re-evaluate and award more points (3 instead of 2)
    - Area is void of adequate storm drains and infrastructure. This is part of a large project. Most drainage in area is surface street gutter flow and inlets discharge untreated runoff. Funding would allow completion of innovative stormwater management practices and manage flows where such infrastructure doesn't exist.
- City of Oceanside: NSDWRC Potable Reuse Project. Disclosure: Justin Gamble from the city of Oceanside is on the PSW but will recuse himself from discussions of the Project. The City requests the following scores be reevaluated:
  - DAC Systems

- 32% of the City's current service area falls within a DAC. 14 DAC blocks will benefit from the project. Capturing stormwater through SEJPA component. IPR will create additional supply to future offset potable demands and add to agriculture in the DAC areas.
- Coastkeeper does not have any projects in Round 1 but has a few comments on scoring. Only a few projects on the list received a top score of 3 in the enhance infrastructure category and most are related to water recycling. This category interprets infrastructure generally. Coastkeeper's position is some infrastructure is better than others. Enhancing regional or local infrastructure for potable reuse is better than purple pipe. The region has done a good job moving forward beyond the 10-year old technology of a purple pipe system. Coastkeeper asks the Workgroup to consider this when selecting projects.
- Over the years we have increased the number of categories and areas that we have to score on. One of these new areas is climate change. Everyone received a 4 in this category. Does there need to be something more stringent for the scoring? For example, if you are being scored on public outreach, putting a project on your website is a basic thing to do and shouldn't receive maximum points. Is something similar happening in this category? May need to be more stringent.
- In addition to receiving the scores, will any of these projects be able to request a debrief on their specific project?
  - Yes, you can request a debrief.

RAC Discussion on Project Tiering:

- Now that we have heard from the public, let's revisit the tiering concerns. Is the line drawn in the correct place between Tier 1 and Tier 2 or not?
- I am on the PSW. Based on some of the comments heard, I want to give some history. In this process, winning the grant is your performance in the interview. A word of caution, we may be staking too much on these numbers from project scoring. The grouping of Tier 1 and Tier 2 gets you in the door, but the project interviews and descriptions are what gets you funding. Project proponents should enter the interviews prepared. I suggest going with the 11 projects in Tier 1, it is more inclusive. The cream of the crop will rise. This ranking will not determine the grant funding that is distributed.
  - Thank you, we will stick with the ranking as presented.

**Water Needs Assessment Update**

---

Ms. Ruth Dela Rosa, County of San Diego gave an update on the status of the Needs Assessment. The Final Water Needs Assessment was been publicly released on May 31. A summary of the comments received are included in Appendix E of the report. The Assessment engaged with 42% of the stakeholders on the identified contact list.

Questions/Comments:

- The product and effort was commendable. It was an excellent report. The State is doing an overall Needs Assessment and what was completed in San Diego is a great basis for that effort.

Visit us at [www.sdirwmp.org](http://www.sdirwmp.org)



## **Final IRWM Plan**

---

Ms. Karina Danek, City of San Diego, presented updates on the release of Phase 2 of the Final 2019 San Diego IRWM Plan Update. The update is complete and has been released to the public. Comments received addressed climate change information in the report. Additionally, OPTI was updated to include all project completion reports for funded projects. In the Fall of 2019, the IRWM Plan Phase 1 and Phase 2 will be adopted.

### *Questions/Comments*

- Why was the RAC only given 2-3 weeks for review? Is there a reason for this timeline?
  - DWR funded the plan update. Therefore, the Plan Update was on a schedule and was broken into two phases due to the timing of reports that needed to be integrated into the Update. The bulk of the updates were completed in Phase 1. We can point exactly to what sections within four chapters were changed in Phase 2 for a more targeted review. The Plan Update has been presented at the past 8 RAC meetings in order to get input. This is the final step.

## **Grant Administration**

---

Ms. Loisa Burton, SDCWA, presented updates on grant administration. In total, the San Diego IRWM Region has received \$96.4 million dollars and 62% of that has been billed to DWR. Rounds 1 and 2 are closing soon. In Prop 84, Round 2, Projects 2, 5, and 7 have completed their projects and will be invited to present at future RAC meetings. Thank you to the volunteers who help support implementation of projects! Projects highlighted at this meeting include the Regional Demand Management Program Expansion funded through Prop 84, Round 3. This Project has issued \$92,000 in rebates, with over 65,000 square feet of turf replaced with sustainable waterwise landscaping. A speece cone will be installed in the Hodges Oxygenation Project. The San Pasqual Tribe Reclaimed Water Expansion Project funded through Round 4 installed 1,700 LF of recycled water with the goal of 9,000 linear feet of recycled water pipe to serve 45 homes.

### *Questions/Comments*

- Thank you for helping us through the project review process. It was painless.

## **Public Comments**

---

- As someone is in the natural space, IRWM Plan Objectives G and I are very important. It appears through the weighting in the scoring process we are leaving some of those projects out. Moving forward, are there ways to include those projects? These projects are being left out and don't have a chance to compete based on the scoring criteria.
  - Scoring criteria weighting was voted on by the RAC at a previous meeting. Weighting aligns with DWR priorities in Proposition 1.
- The San Diego Basin Study presented that the concept of protecting watersheds scored very high in the findings of the 2.5 Report. All planned IRWM projects are included in that analysis and the customized Trade-Off Analysis can be used to look at the projects. This analysis provides a quantitative approach to comparing watersheds to other types of water supply concepts. Additionally, the planning document quantitatively compares watershed benefits to other types of projects.

- We haven't recognized that we carve our watersheds into jurisdictional areas and there is no authority that overlooks over one watershed. Until we have jurisdictional control over our watersheds like LA or other counties do, this problem will continue to arise.
  - I would love to have this discussion on a future agenda. We had a long discussion of the beneficial uses of water, not just water supply. These are incredibly important discussions that this group should be debating and funding.
  - Mark Stadler noted this topic should be included in a future RAC discussion.
  - It is important to note that the reason that the water supply source is weighted high is due to the DWR criteria to address water scarcity. While the RAC discussed the weighting of criteria, certain criteria were bumped up to address the DWR funding criteria for this Round.
- The San Diego Sustainable Living Institute is working on an IRWM funded project with UCSD and one recommendation we are pursuing is a "One Water San Diego." There is a gap and the idea of, "why bother serving watersheds if they don't directly benefit any people in their home?" We need to better connect urban water supply with quantified natural benefits in dollars in order to promote watershed health and make it a more tangible benefit.
- Another good discussion topic at a future RAC discussion would be additional funding sources for IRWM grant opportunities. The RAC could weigh the pros and cons of other potential funding sources that IRWM could pursue along with the strengths and weaknesses of the program when it comes to pursuing other grants.

### **Summary and Next Steps**

---

Ms. Rosalyn Prickett, Woodard & Curran presented a list of upcoming funding opportunities. They have been included in the table below. As soon as more information is received on the Prop 68 funding programs, information will be distributed to the list serve.

#### *Questions/Comments*

- What is desalination construction?
  - There are three different types of Title XVI projects. Desalination is if USBR has approved feasibility studies for desalination (either brackish or seawater). This is a separate bucket that is appropriated by Congress. The City of Oceanside was awarded in 2018 through this program.

Project Types	Deadline	Website
<b>US Bureau of Reclamation</b>		
WIIN Grants	June 28	<a href="https://www.usbr.gov/watersmart/title/">https://www.usbr.gov/watersmart/title/</a>
Desalination Construction	June 28	<a href="https://www.usbr.gov/watersmart/desalination/index.html">https://www.usbr.gov/watersmart/desalination/index.html</a>
Water Marketing Strategy Grants	July 31	<a href="https://www.usbr.gov/watersmart/watermarketing/index.html">https://www.usbr.gov/watersmart/watermarketing/index.html</a>
<b>SWRCB Prop 1 Storm Water Grant Program</b>		
Prop 1 Stormwater Grant Program	Summer 2019 (anticipated)	<a href="https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/swgp/prop1/">https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/swgp/prop1/</a>
Prop 68 Green Infrastructure Grant Program	June 28	<a href="http://resources.ca.gov/grants/green-infrastructure/">http://resources.ca.gov/grants/green-infrastructure/</a>
Prop 68 Groundwater Treatment and Remediation Grant Program	Fall 2019	<a href="https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/propositions/prop68.html">https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/propositions/prop68.html</a>
Prop 68 Sustainable Groundwater Management Grant Program	Planning: Summer 2019 Implementation: Summer 2020	<a href="https://water.ca.gov/Work-With-Us/Grants-And-Loans/Sustainable-Groundwater">https://water.ca.gov/Work-With-Us/Grants-And-Loans/Sustainable-Groundwater</a>

Next RAC Meeting:

- August 7, 2019 – 9:00-11:30 a.m. at SDCWA’s Board Room