



Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) Meeting #43

June 5, 2013

9:00 am – 11:30 am

San Diego County Water Authority Board Room
4677 Overland Ave., San Diego CA 92123

NOTES

Attendance

RAC Members

Ken Weinberg, San Diego County Water Authority (Chair)
Arne Sandvik, Padre Dam Municipal Water District
Anne Bamford, Industrial Environmental Association
Bill Hunter, Santa Fe Irrigation District
Bob Kennedy, Otay Water District/Metro Wastewater Joint Powers Authority
Cathy Pieroni for Marsi Steirer, City of San Diego
Dennis Bowling, Floodplain Management Association
Eric Larson, San Diego County Farm Bureau
Joey Randall for Kimberly Thorner, Olivenhain Municipal Water District
Katie Levy, SANDAG
Kimberly O'Connell, UCSD Clean Water Utility (and alternate, Hawkeye Sheene)
Kirk Ammerman, City of Chula Vista
Leigh Johnson, University of California Cooperative Extension (and alternate, Loretta Bates)
Ligeia Heagy for Crystal Najera, City of Vista
Linda Flournoy, Planning and Engineering for Sustainability
Mo Lahsaie, City of Oceanside
Robyn Badger, San Diego Zoological Society (and alternate Kelly Craig)
Ronald Wootton, Buena Vista Lagoon Foundation
Travis Pritchard, San Diego CoastKeeper
Troy Bankston, County of San Diego

RWVG Staff

Goldy Thach, City of San Diego
Mark Stephens, City of San Diego
Sheri McPherson, County of San Diego
Loisa Burton, San Diego County Water Authority
Mark Stadler, San Diego County Water Authority
Teresa Penunuri, San Diego County Water Authority
Toby Roy, San Diego County Water Authority

Interested Parties to the RAC

Clay Clifton, EcoLayers
Crystal Mohr, RMC Water and Environment
Rosalyn Prickett, RMC Water and Environment
Terrell Breaux, City of San Diego
Bruce Phillips, PACE
Art Harrison, Resident
Tory Walker, Tory Walker Engineering
Sara Agahi, County of San Diego
Helen Davis, City of Santee
Michelle Mattson, ICF International

Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Ken Weinberg, San Diego County Water Authority, welcomed everyone to the meeting. Introductions were made around the room.

DWR Update

No DWR representative attended the meeting, and no DWR update was provided.

Grant Administration

Ms. Loisa Burton, San Diego County Water Authority, provided an update on the status of the Proposition 50 Implementation Grant, the Proposition 84 Planning Grant, and the Proposition 84-Round 1 Implementation Grant. She noted three pending amendments to the Proposition 50 contract were underway, with two additional amendments expected. A meeting has been scheduled for the San Diego County Water Authority to discuss amendment prioritization with DWR. The last Proposition 50 invoices have been submitted to DWR; to date, approximately 40% of the grant award amount has been billed to DWR. The Proposition 84 Planning Grant has two amendments underway – a schedule extension to March 2014, and a minor budget reallocation. Approximately 31% of the planning grant has been billed to DWR to-date. For the Proposition 84-Round 1 Implementation Grant, six of the nine local project sponsor agreements have been executed, with most projects already underway. Progress reports were submitted May 15, 2013, with first invoice submittals due August 15, 2013. Ms. Burton noted that the final website for invoicing submittal will be completed in August 2013.

Mr. Ken Weinberg, San Diego County Water Authority, noted that the Water Authority is committed to grant administration, and is taking efforts to improve the grant invoicing process with DWR. The Water Authority will report out to the RAC in August the results of the pending meeting with DWR to discuss invoicing issues.

Presentation of Integrated Flood Management Study

Mr. Mark Stadler, San Diego County Water Authority, presented a review of the six workgroups that contributed to the 2013 IRWM Plan Update. Four of these workgroups developed planning studies, which were used to inform the 2013 Plan and appended to the 2013 Plan.

Mr. Bruce Phillips, PACE, then presented the Integrated Flood Management Study. Mr. Phillips reviewed the program overview and objectives, which were to characterize regional flood issues, develop guidelines for how land use may affect the health of watersheds, describe how the Region may practice integrated flood management, and develop a strategy for coordination and management of the Region's assets and facilities. Because each watershed is unique and different, flood management needs to be planned on a watershed level. Watersheds were analyzed in flood hazard areas, and an evaluation of distribution of watersheds in floodplains was made. Watersheds were prioritized by the cost of potential damage. Ultimately, the study resulted in a guidance-type document with recommendations (available: http://sdirwmp.org/pdf/SDIRWM_Appendix_7B.pdf).

Questions/Comments

- The study should be communicated with others. Has it been shared with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)? If so, did they provide comments
 - *The USACE was an active participant in the planning study, and attended both workshops.*
- Any sharing with the Mexico side of the Tijuana Watershed?
 - *The study was focused on the Region, so there was not involvement with Mexico. However, the analysis looked at flooding issues associated with the Mexico border.*
- The study did not include infrastructure, which has issues with rain. Seems like we should upgrade infrastructure
 - *Infrastructure is included in recommendations, but was not included in the study because of budget.*
- How much collaboration with the Regional Board was done?
 - *Regional Board representatives were at the first workgroup information, but did not provide any additional information for the study.*
- It would be great to involve the Regional Board, especially with the new MS4 Permit. Recommend trying to meld the 401 compensatory mitigation requirements with flood control projects that have habitat benefits.
 - *This is an excellent idea, and would make a very strong Round 3 Implementation Grant project. Please keep this in mind when submitting projects!*
- Describe damage by types – clarify that impacts don't evaluate secondary or tertiary impacts from flood (indirect flood impacts). Please make this clear in the document
 - *The study does clarify primary damage impacts from flood as well as secondary and tertiary impacts to the environment and water quality.*
- There is some concern about the objectivity of the project selection analysis. This seems to be somewhat subjective.
 - *In the process you can use consistency ratio to see if weighting is off – this ratio is a way to normalize the scoring to make it more objective.*

- Would like to see contributing factors considered in the analysis – such as the permeability of soils. These kind of factors are not static, and should be considered variable.
- Would like cost of maintenance factored into the analysis. It seems that flood analyses often focus on capital costs, and ignore maintenance costs.

San Diego IRWM Plan Update

Implementation Action Items

Mr. Mark Stadler presented an overview of the proposed priorities list as provided by the four planning studies: Regulatory Workgroup Report, Land Use Planning Study, Climate Change Planning Study, and Integrated Flood Management Planning Study. There are approximately 60 recommendations from these reports – during the April RAC meeting, RAC members and all IRWM stakeholders were asked to help refine the list into short- and long-term priorities. Priorities included in the Plan are those that can be expected to be completed or well established during the life of this iteration of the Plan, expected to be approximately 5 years.

Mr. Stadler explained that priority commitments will still be accepted by members of the RAC and other stakeholders in attendance. Mr. Stadler then provided an overview of the commitments that have been made to-date:

- Every recommended action from the Regulatory Workgroup Report has a champion – although please note that some of the commitments are different from the recommended action in the Workgroup Report. In some instances, the commitments were modified to align with agency or organizational commitments.
- Many of the Land Use Planning Study and Integrated Flood Management Planning Study recommendations have commitments – the Zoological Society of San Diego, the Industrial Environmental Association, the Floodplain Management Association, the County, the Water Authority, the City Public Utilities Department, and the City Stormwater Department are those who made these commitments.
- Only one of the Climate Change Planning Study recommendations received a supporting (not an implementation) champion.

Questions/Comments

- You mentioned that the action items without commitments would be separated from those with commitments in the 2013 IRWM Plan. Can we keep the nomenclature of these items as “action items” even though they do not have commitments?
 - *Yes, we will keep this nomenclature.*
- Would like to note that it is very important that all of the regulatory items have commitments. The workgroup worked very hard to create these, and feel that they are important for the Region to implement.
 - *Thank you to those who made commitments!*

Presentation of Draft 2013 IRWM Plan

Ms. Sheri McPherson, County of San Diego, then provided information about the 2013 IRWM Plan, which was updated based upon the 2007 IRWM Plan but with the addition of new planning documents and reports, planning studies, and stakeholder input. The 2013 IRWM Plan was also updated to meet new IRWM Plan requirements established by the Department of Water Resources (DWR).

Ms. McPherson then provided an overview of each of the eleven 2013 IRWM Plan Chapters:

Chapter 1, Introduction:

This chapter includes the purpose and organization of the 2013 IRWM Plan purpose and organization, the governance structure (RWMG) and IRWM Program structure, describes how the 2013 IRWM Plan is consistent with IRWM Plan Guidelines (DWR requirements), and includes an overview of challenges and conflicts in water management and how IRWM planning can help address them.

Chapter 2, Vision and Objectives:

This chapter includes the IRWM Vision, Mission, Goals, and Objectives. The IRWM Vision is: an integrated, balanced, and consensus-based approach to ensuring the long-term sustainability of the Region's water supply, water quality, and natural resources.

The 2013 IRWM Plan has eleven objectives, which were updated with extensive input from stakeholders. The 2013 IRWM Plan also includes new pass/fail rules for projects: 1) To be included in the San Diego IRWM Plan, all implementation projects must contribute to at least one IRWM Plan objective, 2) To be considered for IRWM funding, implementation projects must contribute to the attainment of Objective A, Objective B, and at least one other objective. The IRWM objectives are:

- A. Encourage the development of integrated solutions to address water management issues and conflicts
- B. Maximize stakeholder/community involvement and stewardship of water resources, emphasizing education and outreach
- C. Effectively obtain, manage, and assess water resource data and information
- D. Further the scientific and technical foundation of water management
- E. Develop and maintain a diverse mix of water resources, encouraging their efficient use and development of local water supplies
- F. Construct, operate, and maintain a reliable infrastructure system
- G. Enhance natural hydrologic processes to reduce the effects of hydromodification and encourage integrated flood management
- H. Effectively reduce sources of pollutants and environmental stressors to protect and enhance human health, safety, and the environment
- I. Protect, restore, and maintain habitat and open space
- J. Optimize water-based recreational opportunities
- K. Effectively address climate change through adaptation or mitigation in water resource management

Chapter 3, Region Description:

This chapter was comprehensively updated with: new information available since 2007, planning studies conducted specifically for the IRWM Program, and input from the RAC and other stakeholders. This chapter includes a summary of regional water resources with tables that are generally organized by watershed. This chapter also includes three new sections: Stormwater Management, Flood Management, and Climate Change.

Chapter 4, Tribal Nations:

This chapter is an entirely new chapter that was created based on data review and outreach to tribal nations. Information in this chapter was vetted extensively by tribal representatives, and includes a description of tribal reservations and groups and an overview of water management issues on tribal lands.

Chapter 5, Watershed Characterizations:

This chapter is an entirely new chapter that was created based on data review and outreach through Watershed Workshops conducted in September 2012. Each watershed description contains information on hydrology, water systems, land uses, stormwater and flood, natural resources, and management issues and conflicts.

Chapter 6, Governance & Stakeholder Involvement:

This chapter describes the overall governance structure of the IRWM Program and stakeholder involvement that has taken place to-date. This chapter was updated based on extensive outreach conducted since 2007, including input from a specific ad-hoc workgroup that was convened to discuss governance and financing of the IRWM Program (Governance and Financing Workgroup). Although the workgroup did not recommend making changes to the overall governance structure, the workgroup drafted a formal charter for the RAC, which is included in this chapter.

Chapter 7, Regional Coordination:

This chapter includes information about coordination of information and planning studies across the IRWM Region. This chapter also includes a high-level summary of the planning studies that were conducted for the 2013 IRWM Plan. Those studies, which include *Collaboration with Regional Board*, *Salinity Nutrient Management Planning Guidelines*, *Integrated Flood Management*, *Climate Change Analysis*, *Water Management and Land Use* are appended to Chapter 7 of the 2013 IRWM Plan.

Chapter 8, Resource Management:

This chapter was updated based on the Resource Management Strategies (RMS) in the *2009 California Water Plan Update*. This chapter includes all of the RMS that were deemed, through stakeholder input, to be applicable to the IRWM Region. This chapter also includes additional RMS that were identified by stakeholders, and includes examples of how the RMS are being implemented in the IRWM Region.

Chapter 9, Project Evaluation and Prioritization:

This chapter outlines the general process for selecting projects for future rounds of grant funding. Information in this chapter includes updates to project scoring that were made to better-sort projects based on their value to the Region and based on the principles of IRWM planning. This chapter was updated based on input from an ad-hoc workgroup that was convened for the 2013

IRWM Plan (the Priorities and Metrics Workgroup), the workgroup that was convened to evaluate and recommend projects to be funded for Round 2 of Proposition 84 Implementation Grant funding, and the RAC.

Chapter 10, Data & Technical Analysis:

This chapter summarizes technical resources that are available in the Region for water-based planning purposes. This chapter acknowledges a future comprehensive Data Management System (DMS) that is being developed by the County, and includes a new “WaterGIS” database that is available on www.sdirwmp.org website.

Chapter 11, Implementation:

This chapter includes a series of “action items” that were developed based on the planning study recommendations (described in Chapter 7), and have received implementation commitments from a stakeholder in the Region. This chapter also includes information about updating and revising the IRWM Plan, including production of a Report Card every three years. Further, this chapter includes a comprehensive table of potential financing options for the IRWM Program and for IRWM projects.

Questions/Comments

- Does Chapter 7 (Regional Coordination) include coordination with other plans in the Region?
 - *Yes, Chapter 7 does identify other planning documents, and also describes how other planning processes were directly or indirectly involved (via information) with the 2013 IRWM Plan.*
- For Chapter 9 – shouldn’t the scoring to be modified so that the minimum points are assigned to projects that meet three objectives (based on the new pass/fail scoring criteria).
 - *Yes, thank you for your comment. We will make this change.*

Public Involvement Process

Ms. Thach then explained the public involvement process that has occurred during development of the 2013 IRWM Plan. She noted that five public workshops (co-hosted with RAC meetings) were held during development of the 2013 IRWM Plan. In addition to the public workshops, the IRWM Program conducted four separate tribal outreach meetings, two DAC outreach meetings, and four watershed workshops. A second series of watershed workshops will be held in July 2013 to present the draft 2013 IRWM Plan, watershed characterizations, and disadvantaged community issues. Watershed workshops will be held based on watershed locations. Further details about the timing and location of these meetings will be sent out through the IRWM stakeholder email list.

Questions/Comments

- Mo Lahsaie, City of Oceanside, offered the City of Oceanside’s Community Room facilities to host the San Juan/Santa Margarita/San Luis Rey Watershed Workshop.
- Ligeia Hegy, City of Vista, offered the City of Vista’s facilities to host the Carlsbad/San Dieguito Watershed Workshop.
- Where are we with the state approval process? How will the state approve of the 2013 IRWM Plan? Will they make edits.

- *At this time there is not a formal process for the state to approve of IRWM plans. What DWR has said is that the Round 3 Proposition 84 Implementation Grant Application will be conducted in two steps (similar to Proposition 50). During Step 1, regions will submit their completed IRWM Plans for a consistency review. If deemed consistent with the Guidelines, DWR will ask regions to submit complete grant applications.*
- Do the watershed chapters have a tie-in to the new MS4 Permit watershed process?
 - *We did reach out to MS4 groups in the watersheds, and the 2013 IRWM Plan explains the new permit. We will update this section prior to release of the Final Draft.*
- Mr. Mo Lahsaie announced that the Regional Board adopted the new MS4 Permit. With this permit, there are even more relevant stormwater planning topics that are relevant to the IRWM Program. Specifically, the Regional Board is taking a no-tolerance policy with respect to over-irrigation. This will help greatly with both water quality improvements and water conservation – it is an integrated approach to managing important regional issues.

Next Joint Public Workshop & RAC Meeting – August 7, 2013

The next joint public workshop and RAC meeting will be held on Wednesday August 7, 2013 from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. at San Diego County Water Authority Board Room (4677 Overland Ave., San Diego, CA 92123).

RAC meetings to be held in 2013 are scheduled for the following dates:

- Wednesday, August 7th
- Wednesday, October 2nd
- Wednesday, December 4th