



Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) Meeting #87

October 7, 2020
9:00 am – 11:30 am

Zoom Meeting

NOTES

Attendance

RAC Members

Richard Whipple, County of San Diego (Chair)
Ann Van Leer, Escondido Creek Conservancy
Rania Amen for Al Lau, 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
Jennifer Hazard and Oscar Romo, Rural Community Assistance Corporation
Jonathan Witt, San Diego County Office of Education
Julia Escamilla, Rincon del Diablo Municipal Water District
Keli Balo for Surraya Rashid, City of San Diego
Julie Kalansky, San Diego Regional Climate Collaborative
Justin Gamble, City of Oceanside
Elizabeth Lovsted for Kelley Gage, San Diego County Water Authority
Kimberly O'Connell, UCSD Clean Water Utility
Joseph Randall for Kimberly Thorner, Olivenhain Municipal Water District
Marisa Soriano, City of Chula Vista
Mark Seits, Floodplain Management Association
Michael McSweeney and Wayne Rosenbaum, Building Industry Association
Michelle Berens, Helix Water District
Chris Trees, San Elijo Joint Powers Authority
Patrick McDonough, San Diego Coastkeeper
Phil Pryde and Rob Hutsel, San Diego River Park Foundation
Kelly Craig, Zoological Society of San Diego
Ron Mosher, Sweetwater Authority
Sandra Jacobson, California Trout
Seval Sen, Padre Dam Municipal Water District
Beth Gentry, City of El Cajon

RWMG Staff and Consultants

Chelsea McGimpsey, County of San Diego
Karina Danek, City of San Diego
Loisa Burton, San Diego County Water Authority
Mark Stadler, San Diego County Water Authority
Mark Stephens, City of San Diego
Nicole Poletto, Woodard & Curran
Sally Johnson, Woodard & Curran

Sarah Brower, City of San Diego
Stephanie Gaines, County of San Diego
Roselyn Prickett, Woodard & Curran

Interested Parties to the RAC

Aaron Cook, Fallbrook Public Utilities Department
Anne Bamford, Industrial Environmental Association
Cassidy Thornbury, Carollo Engineers
Christopher Paulino, Viejas Tribal Government
Gail Patton, San Diego County Water Authority
Jim Rasmus, Carollo Engineers
Joni German, San Diego County Water Authority
Khadija Wade, City of San Diego Public Utilities Department
Lynn Rodriguez, Watersheds Coalition of Ventura County IRWM Region
Nancy Vogel, California Natural Resources Agency
Robert Leiter, American Planning Association / STAY COOL for Grandkids
Vic Nguyen, Department of Water Resources

Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Rich Whipple, County of San Diego welcomed everyone to the virtual RAC meeting. Ms. Sally Johnson, Woodard & Curran reviewed the virtual meeting process including how to use the virtual controls and chat feature. Meeting participants were encouraged to enter their name and organization into the chat for roll call.

Water Resilience Portfolio

Ms. Nancy Vogel, California Natural Resources Agency and Director of the Governor's Water Portfolio Program presented on the Final Water Resilience Portfolio released on July 28, 2020. The Water Resilience Portfolio is Governor Gavin Newsom's blueprint for equipping California to build a climate-resilient water system in the face of climate change, solicited in Executive Order N-10-19. August 2020 was the hottest year on record, and the Portfolio is focused on climate change.

The Governor asked that the Portfolio prioritize:

- Projects that offer multiple benefits
- Use of natural infrastructure such as forests and floodplains
- Innovation and new technologies
- Regional approaches among water users
- Examination of successful models from outside California
- Integration of investments, policies, and programs across state government
- Partnerships with local, federal, and tribal governments, water agencies and irrigation districts, and other stakeholders.

The draft Water Resilience Portfolio was released in January 2020. More than 200 letters containing hundreds of specific edits and recommendations were submitted. The San Diego IRWM Program submitted a letter alongside the Roundtable of Regions. The final Portfolio includes changes that added 14 new actions and deleted 5 actions. Most of the new actions in the final Portfolio focused on upper watershed health, tribal interests and

leadership, cross-border water issues, urban stream restoration, and management of stormwater, flood, and salinity.

The final Portfolio assigns the 142 actions to responsible state agencies and departments. The proposed ballot measure to pay for implementation of the Water Resilience Portfolio was redirected in a changing economy due to COVID. Therefore, it is necessary to utilize existing resources to make progress on the State recommendations and get creative. There are 11 key Portfolio priorities that will be implemented in the coming years:

1. **Implement the Safe and Affordable Drinking Water Act:** This prioritizes funds to community projects for water systems that are out of compliance. It will accelerate consolidations for water systems that are failing at providing safe drinking water.
2. **Support Local Implementation of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act:** DWR is currently reviewing the first rounds of groundwater sustainability plans. If plans do not meet sustainable levels of pumping and recharge in the Basin, the State can step in.
3. **Achieve Voluntary Agreements:** Meet the Delta Water Quality Control Plan requirements. Recent requirements from ESA in the Delta has caused complications. The goal is to find flexible ways beyond regulations to meet water quality and habitat goals.
4. **Update Regulations to Expand Water Recycling:** The City of LA has committed to water recycling and is working on making the first ever raw water augmentation regulations by 2035.
5. **Promote Healthy Soils:** Promote efforts of farmers to add more organic content to the soil.
6. **Restore Multi-Benefit Floodplains:** Implement restoration projects in floodplains.
7. **Accelerate Smart New Water Storage Projects:** New milestones must be achieved by January 2022 to increase the total storage capacity in the State. State agencies are working with project proponents to calculate the public benefits of these projects.
8. **Modernize Delta Conveyance:** This system is at risk from climate change. DWR is building a project for another point of diversion in the Sacramento River in the North Delta to connect it with an underground tunnel almost 30 miles long. Salinity management in the Delta will become increasingly difficult.
9. **Stabilize the Salton Sea:** The drying of the Salton Sea poses a threat to public health in communities surrounding the Sea.
10. **Remove Obsolete Klamath River Dams:** The Klamath is the second largest river in California and would benefit from the removal of dams.
11. **Better Coordinate and Leverage Data**

Nancy Vogel acknowledged that the Portfolio will rely on programs like IRWM to implement actions. During her presentation to the RAC she stated, “given the IRWM approach and the approach featured in the Portfolio, the two fit together nicely.”

Questions/Comments

- Do you anticipate any changes to the Portfolio based on recent wildfires and potential increase with climate change, etc.?
 - The Portfolio will not be revised but will be implemented as is. Folks have been busy this year with over 4 million acres burned in California. We need to step back and think about wildfire threat to water systems outside of siltation and burning pumping stations, but also drinking water quality issues like benzyne and water quality contaminants entering the water system.

Visit us at www.sdirwmp.org

- That was a great presentation, very informative big picture of what is happening!
- What role do you see for the 48 IRWM planning regions in implementation of the Portfolio?
 - A dominant theme of the Water Resilience Portfolio is regional coordination, and that is IRWM. With no additional resources coming from the State, we have to build on existing networks and trusted relationships the IRWM program has already built. There are also many watershed efforts outside of IRWM. But because we have invested over \$1 billion dollars in funds to IRWM over the years, we are hoping you can help us get creative and continue the coordination through regional resilience. We need you to help carry out the Portfolio.
- Was the role of regenerative farming practices (use of organics/compost, no till methods, etc.) considered in the development of the Portfolio?
 - Our partners at the Department of Food and Agriculture made sure there were several actions in the Portfolio that were related to healthy soils. There are a few State programs that support regenerative agriculture. If we had additional funding, we would be bolstering these programs.
- How will the Portfolio address MCLs for PFAS compounds?
 - We don't directly address MCLs other than to urge the State Water Resources Control Board to continue source control programs for emerging contaminants, sediment, and others.
- Is a climate and resilience bond measure anticipated for 2022?
 - Not sure, I am not talking to the legislature. We see the need but am not privy to that conversation at this moment. However, no one wants to see all the thought on how to structure the previous bond that is no longer on the ballot go to waste.
- Excellent presentation. Do you think there is anything that might need to be added to IRWM regarding current fire issues and climate change?
 - To the degree that IRWM can focus on the most pressing issues like upper watershed health and SGMA (Sustainable Groundwater Management Act), it becomes more valuable from the State perspective. Take your networks and help us address these issues. Folks have been working for years now to tighten the connection between the upper and lower watersheds. Healthy upper watersheds in terms of water supply and water quality makes it an obvious connection and feeds into the regional perspective.
- What progress are you making on developing the implementation plan for the Portfolio recommendations?
 - The plan is underway. Recommendations have been divided among Portfolio teams. Many of the actions need interagency coordination. Where we have the resources, we are getting that work underway and tracking our progress. Sometime this winter we are hoping to have a public forum to update everyone on our progress.
- With the current deficit, how will the State move forward on implementation?
 - The 11 actions are the priorities that this administration has pulled up from the Portfolio. With our existing resources we intend to make progress on these existing fronts.
- Did the state analyze cost comparisons between expanded dams for storage (that would provide storage for another Oroville), vs. expanding potable recycling? I'm concerned that scientific forecasts show the Sierra snowpack will continue to dwindle, and thus the dams may become obsolete sooner than we think.

We need to heavily invest in potable recycling throughout the state to increase climate resiliency. Did the State analyze cost comparisons?

- I don't know if there is a specific cost comparison. No one is talking about expanding Oroville. One of the water projects that the Water Commission is willing to fund is a reservoir to the west of Colusa county. Our regions are so diverse; our demands and supplies are diverse; we need to make progress on all fronts. We will need additional water storage. We do know the Sierra snowpack is going to shrink. That means we are going to get more rainy storms and we need to be ready to capture water in flashy years in order to get through the dry years.
- Do you do a cost benefit analysis when considering any policy changes?
 - No, we didn't step back and hire economists to do a cost benefit analysis.
- How will you engage stakeholders like the IRWM regions in developing and tracking the implementation plan? How can we engage in that process?
 - I hope this winter to have a public forum to talk about the progress that we've made to date and next summer hope to have a written report that will describe that progress. I'm not sure what kind of involvement in our progress reporting you would want.
- Does the Portfolio address the benefits of allocating funding and other resources to "self-help" regions that enact regional and local funding sources e.g., parcel taxes for water quality and stormwater management?
 - No, it is not addressed in the Portfolio. We are hoping to utilize federal and local resources wherever possible to address these actions.
- Thanks for the presentation. In Southern California when upper watersheds are disconnected from lower watersheds by dams which provide zero flow, except in extreme conditions, are projects which augment flows downstream for natural systems benefits being considered?
 - We talk about instream flow requirements. We've talked to watershed stakeholders about it and mapped it. In the appendices, we have very few places in California where we have in-stream flow requirements to protect habitat. It is a painstaking process for the Department of Fish and Wildlife to implement. We need to find a way at the state level to do the in-stream analyses more quickly so the State Water Resources Control Board can determine the requirements for fish and wildlife faster. A watershed should be able to work around that. We need to understand those needs and plan for drought.

Future of San Diego IRWM – Summit Feedback

Ms. Stephanie Gaines, County of San Diego provided an overview of the IRWM Summit that was hosted in March. One of the activities during the Summit was to collect feedback on the future of the IRWM Program. During the Summit, attendees were asked what the San Diego IRWM Program should look like in the next four years. Feedback boards were divided into categories and attendees used stickers to prioritize ideas. Priorities were organized into five key themes:

1. Expand topics and activities
2. Engage with more entities and initiatives
3. Go beyond planning and funding
4. Increase funding-related support

Visit us at www.sdirwmp.org

5. Encourage changes at State level to improve funding and administration process

The first three themes were discussed at the August RAC meeting in small breakout rooms. The last two themes were discussed during this RAC meeting in small breakout rooms. The purpose of the discussion is to provide actionable recommendations for the RWMG to implement for the future of the San Diego IRWM Program.

The key takeaways from the breakout rooms are identified below. Similar themes to the August RAC Meeting were heard:

Theme 4: Increase Funding Related Support

- Networking opportunities with the RAC would be helpful to foster partnerships.
- Can IRWM service DACs through grant admin & support services?
- NGOs may be excluded from the grant application due to minimum grant size (\$500,000), which is unwieldy to operate. Are there opportunities to add an NGO component to existing projects pursuing larger funding opportunities?
 - DWR doesn't like this additional layer of "complication"
- Issue w/ regulatory side of things. DACs need help w/ regulation hurdles. IRWM could provide a service to help DACs do that.
- Helping people understand what they are getting into if they do accept the grant:
 - Labor compliance
 - Post grant expenses
- Establish an IRWM directory for stakeholders to understand other players and jurisdictional boundaries for potential partnerships.
- Provide a list of benefits to partner with NGOs (cheaper, community connections, nimble)
 - These both may be underutilized and not worth effort
- Provide opportunities for RAC members to introduce who they are and what area they work in (coincides with partnership opportunities)
- Include DACs that are not captured in mapping
- Can IRWM apply to federal funds? FEMA?
- Disburse a pot of money to issue small scale grants to DACs and NGOs to implement projects: (\$50,000-\$100,000)
- Need to have some method by which IRWM can be a direct grant recipient for funds to be used for project feasibility, development, and construction for URCs/DACs
 - Assist with project design, address regulatory hurdles, establish true cost of project implementation
 - Allow IRWM to act similar to the planning/environmental department of larger jurisdictions
 - Partner with the jurisdiction that the project will be located in; require that jurisdiction to review project feasibility and sign off
 - Some disagreement – jurisdictions have limited funds and can't be responsible for all project reviews; that's why IRWM could serve in that role on behalf of the region
- Encourage the State to allow funds to be used for planning for URC projects; IRWM to serve as entity providing planning, grant application, and grant administration support
- Cash flow is critical – small NGOs need cash flow every month
 - Different rate of payment/reimbursement for URCs, based on the needs of NGO/URC
 - Have larger organization or IRWM be official recipient of funds to better manage cash flow; allow quicker payment (or advanced payment) to URCs
- Two issues: 1) What kind of resources are needed to get through feasibility analysis? 2) What kind of payment scheme is needed to effectively construct in a URC?

- Focus on social and environmental justice (incl public health and public safety) – we’re seeing that definition of DACs in IRWM are different from some of those other programs.
 - Look for ways to standardize or simplify the definition of DACs at a regional scale?
- Can we refocus on water security and how impacted different communities will be, not just economic factors? If groundwater dependent, may want to focus resources there even if not fall within current definition of DACs. Use a different lens.

Theme 5: Encourage changes at State level to Improve Funding Process

- Advanced Funding is currently 50% of project up to \$1 million
 - Ex: Most projects are under \$1 million; but total package is \$3 million. So they are not qualified for advanced funding
 - Advocate for ability to invoice state for expenses incurred. Can we provide proof of debt instead of proof of payment?
 - Waive 10% retention: one project has been waiting for 1 year and paying interest on this.
 - Individual invoicing or other options
- Advocate for flexibility of programs and work plans
- Invite state decision makers to workshops; discuss with them the lengthy payment processes; to demonstrate challenges/obstacles
- Something needs to change at the top, how can we change DWR’s mentality to help community projects?
- Bring together rate assistance w/project delivery to make project implementation more affordable.
- IRWM helps to deliver low cost projects – focus on this message at State!

Diversity and Inclusion

Ms. Gaines introduced the discussion of diversity and inclusion in the San Diego IRWM Program. During this meeting, we will introduce the topic and want to know more about what diversity and inclusion in relation to the San Diego IRWM program means to our stakeholders.

The Bay Area IRWMP Coordinating Committee sent a letter to the Roundtable of Regions with a few requested actions to better incorporate equity and historic racism in the IRWM Program. These actions include urging DWR to work with legislators to modify the definition of DACs to consider historic racism, assisting DWR in understanding the unique challenges and need for flexibility when reviewing projects for funding, forming a workgroup to develop guidance on how to ensure equitable outcomes within IRWM, and organizing a panel at the October virtual summit on advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion in IRWM. Mark Stadler, co-chair of the Roundtable of Regions and San Diego IRWM Program manager, has been in touch with the coordinating committee and has been working with DWR to address the items as the Program is able.

It is possible to interpret diversity and inclusion in the San Diego IRWM Program through multiple lenses. This may include diversity of organizations or individuals on the RAC, geography of participants, or diversity of funded projects. Sixty organizations have participated on the RAC throughout the years. The Program is always looking to improve and make sure that we engage everyone that has some level of interest in water and resource management. We want to know if voices are equally distributed in our membership. Are we being as inclusive as possible?

Funded projects have been distributed throughout the region and 27 DAC and Tribal projects have been funded during previous rounds of funding. Are we funding diverse projects in the Region? Are we looking at an equitable distribution in the lens of environmental justice? Are there areas that we can improve the diversity of projects around the Region? We plan to discuss this topic further during the December RAC meeting.

Visit us at www.sdirwmp.org

Questions/Comments

- Why would we expend this effort? DACs get extra points in the scoring process. Based on my experience with this group, I haven't seen anyone discriminated against. It seems like a solution in search of a problem.
 - We don't have to do anything. It is up to the RAC to see how we want to proceed. Diversity and inclusion are currently being presented in different organizations and legislation. If there are additional steps that the RAC wants to take in the San Diego IRWM Program, we can.
- If we look at socioeconomic factors as a barrier to a community receiving the level of service that they should, then the system has made a decision that looking at DACs is an important thing to do. If there is another barrier that shows there hasn't been an equitable level of service, what is it and how can we resolve it?
 - I agree.
 - Thanks for your clarification, that was helpful.
- We need to add equity to the definition of DACs. We need to look and make sure that our processes and procedures are fair in the way that we distribute the resources and look at the disparity of the outcomes of our programs. There is disparity in diversity and inclusion.
- In our breakout room, we discussed expanding the definition of DAC to people experiencing homelessness or on fixed income.
- Are there regions other than the Bay Area looking at this topic now?
 - We aren't sure, we have discussed it at the Roundtable.
- Do we have a list of organizations that are not members of the RAC? It seems like that list might be shorter!
- This is great inclusive slide of various organizations. Not to say that SDIRWM is excluding but I agree that we should keep an open mind. There are always opportunities to strengthen ourselves.
 - I agree. It's a foundation to grow on. We always need to strive to do better.
- There is one metric that might be helpful to have for this conversation. We've funded about \$15M in DAC and Tribal projects. If we look at this as a portion of the Region's population, is the \$15M we've funded to these projects comparable to the money that has been invested in the population on a per capita basis? It would be helpful to get a per capita dollar value for DAC and non-DAC projects. It seems to me that these numbers should be in the same range and an indicator if we are putting the money in the correct places.
 - We could do that but it may be comparing apples and oranges here. Some of the DAC projects are in rural areas where the population is a lot lower. 78% of San Diego lives in an urban area. We need to keep this in mind.
- There may be an issue with the map. A DAC is focused on economics and is different from an underrepresented community (URC). I don't know how to capture that with a geographic dot. Is there a way to focus on the URC rather than DACs? They are not mutually exclusive.
 - Yes, that is a good comment. We put this map together about a year ago to understand where we've been distributing funding. It doesn't necessarily point out where DACs are, but it demonstrates where in the Region we have awarded projects and overlaid that with CalEnviroScreen data.

- Is the dot on the map located at the site of the project or where the benefit is received? It is hard to know if the people who are underrepresented are receiving the benefit.
 - The dots show where the project is located, it does not necessarily capture where the benefits are received. Regional projects are also not shown as dots.
 - We need to take a deeper dive to understand how we are applying the equity in diversity and inclusion to some of the awarded grant funds.
- It may be interesting to go back to the 27 grant applications of DAC and Tribal projects that have been funded and pull out the language that they used on who they were trying to serve.
- I'd like to make an observation. RAC Members aren't elected officials so the communities that we are representing didn't choose us. We are the ones that are choosing the projects for the benefits of our communities but some of the projects in here it seems like the community should have a voice to determine if the project is beneficial to them. For some projects in particular, you hope that the project is in tune with what the community wants. To understand some of these equity questions, we need to dig deeper.
 - More outreach and engagement to the communities that may be affected by the projects that are chosen would be beneficial.

RAC Membership

Ms. Karina Danek, City of San Diego discussed RAC Membership. At the Summit there was some interest in adding new entities to sit on the RAC, in particular, a representative of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). The RWMG is in discussion with the San Luis Rey Groundwater Sustainability Agency to add a SGMA representative as a non-voting seat. This seat will replace the non-voting State Coastal Conservancy seat that has remained open.

In 2021, the RWMG will consider the addition of a 32nd voting seat on the RAC. We would like to know who you think is missing from the table and should be represented on the RAC. Are there any organizations that you recommend? We want to know what the interest is in adding a 32nd voting seat, effective 2021. We want to know who is missing from the RAC, what should the RAC look for, and are there any individuals or organizations you would recommend? Feedback from this discussion is included in the Questions/Comments section below.

Every two years, approximately half of the RAC seats turnover to facilitate broader stakeholder participation and ensure that all stakeholders have an equal opportunity to serve on the RAC. Thirteen seats are currently open and solicitations to join the RAC Member Selection Workgroup were sent via email in September. All caucus members had a say in who to nominate from their caucus to form the Workgroup. The poll feature on Zoom was used to take a RAC member vote: "Do you recommend the RAC Member Selection Workgroup as shown on the slide?"

Yes: 21

No: 0

Abstain: 0

The RAC member application and nomination period closes on November 9 and the workgroup will meet mid-November to appoint new members to be reviewed by the RWMG. New members will be announced at the December RAC meeting and membership will be in effect from January 2021-December 2024. More information on the attributes and general duties of RAC members can be found online. Applications are available for download here: <https://sdirwmp.org/regional-advisory-committee> and are due **November 9, 2020**. For

Visit us at www.sdirwmp.org

questions about the process or to submit a completed application, please contact Mark Stadler, IRWM Program Manager, mstadler@sdewa.org.

Questions/Comments:

- We are missing a representative for Fire Fighting/ Fire Management.
 - Fire is a good idea.
- Are we looking to move a non-voting seat to a voting seat? A current non-voting representative could be moved to a voting representative.
 - We haven't considered that possibility but that is a great suggestion.
 - I like this idea and would also support the SGMA seat becoming a voting member.
 - I agree with the idea of adding SGMA as a voting member. I think they will be a big factor in water conservation and use going forward.
- How about adding a seat for the State Water Board? They have a new engagement unit and Shen Huang is in charge of the engagement in Southern California. They work with DAC water systems that are looking to consolidate so there would be a lot of great consolidation projects.
- San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E) has a fire science and climate adaptation program with meteorologists on staff. Lots of environmental data collection that is publicly available as well on their website.
- I'd like to see us add a voting seat on organized labor. They are interested in water and represent a significant part of the economy and population.
- In light of our recent discussion, what about another urban DAC/URC? Maybe Urban League? There are others as well.
- Regarding what we might be missing - The RAC talked some time ago about an (academic) institution that engaged in student water technology training, such as Cuyamaca College.
- What is our mission? These are water related issues. If we want to devolve into a debating society, I could think of 50 groups that could join. It is important to stick to our mission and not underrepresent anyone interested in diversity and inclusion. I've never seen anyone on here who was marginalized. Everyone has an agenda and opinion and adding more agendas will make it more difficult to get us where we need to go.
- I support a Fire representative and the SGMA representative.
 - I like the fire representative
 - Same here. I support a Fire representative.
- Question/observation. I was trying to think of other people that may be useful. I think climate will be very important.
 - I agree. Climate is and will continue to be an important factor in our program to consider, and representation in this area would be key.
 - I agree that we could use more support from the climate perspective
- Definitely someone who could lend a voice regarding fire and climate change.

- There are really good cases being made for a fire representative and for a second climate change representative (from a different area of expertise). Thank you, all!

Grant Administration

Ms. Loisa Burton, San Diego County Water Authority presented updates on grant administration. In total, the San Diego IRWM Region has received \$111.7 million dollars and 64% of that has been billed to DWR (\$71.1 million). Proposition 84, Round 3 is almost complete (5 of 7 projects completed). This contract was extended to 2021 to continue to allow more rebates under one of the projects. Proposition 84, Round 4 was also allowed to be extended and projects will now be completed at the end of December 2023. Projects from this round including Project 10: Safari Park Drought Response and Outreach were highlighted.

Ms. Burton provided an update on upcoming program activities for Proposition 1, Round 1 which was recently contracted. The Webtool 2.0 is in the early stages of development. The tool will enhance the SDIRWM grants webtool and is taking Local Project Sponsors recommended improvements into account.

There have been project delays due to COVID-19. One project adapted project outreach during the pandemic to a virtual PSA. The Regional Drought Resilience Program from the San Diego County Water Authority created an “I Love Water” PSA to encourage conserving water and turning it off when not in use. The PSA can be viewed here: <https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLDAaIoUVyu-rwe1Wmg-OiRQI-Ks5aIkb6>.

Public Comments

None

Summary and Next Steps

Ms. Johnson presented a list of upcoming funding opportunities. They have been included in the table below.

Project Types	Deadline	Website
Prop 1 Technical Assistance Funding Program	Open: rolling	https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/proposition1/tech_asst_funding.html
USEPA – Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (WIFIA)	October 15	https://www.epa.gov/wifia
Proposition 68 Sustainable Groundwater Management Grant Program	Anticipated December 2020	https://water.ca.gov/Work-With-Us/Grants-And-Loans/Sustainable-Groundwater
2021 Nonpoint Source Grant Program	December 18	https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/nps/319grants.html

Next RAC Meeting:

- December 2, 2020 – 9:00-11:30 a.m. via virtual platform.

Projected dates for 2021 are below. Please add them to your calendar:

- February 3, 2021

- April 7, 2021
- June 2, 2021
- August 4, 2021
- October 6, 2021
- December 1, 2021