



**Regional Advisory Council  
Meeting #5 Notes**

March 19, 2007, 1:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.  
San Diego County Water Authority  
4677 Overland Avenue, San Diego, CA 92123

**Attendance – RAC Members**

---

Craig Adams, San Dieguito River Valley Conservancy  
Rick Alexander on behalf of Dennis Bostad, Sweetwater Authority  
Kirk Ammerman, City of Chula Vista  
Maleah Ashford, Consultant to the City of Encinitas  
Michael Bardin, Santa Fe Irrigation District  
Chris Basilevac, The Nature Conservancy  
Neal Brown, Padres Dam Municipal Water District  
Michael Connolly, Campo Kumeyaay Nation  
Kathleen Flannery, County of San Diego  
Linda Flournoy, Sustainability Consultant  
Dave Gibson, San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board  
Doug Gibson, San Elijo Lagoon Conservancy  
Keith Greer on behalf of Shelby Tucker, San Diego Association of Governments  
Rob Hutsel, San Diego River Park Foundation  
Megan Johnson, Southern California Wetlands Recovery Network  
Eric Larson, Farm Bureau of San Diego County  
Keith Lewinger, Fallbrook Public Utility District  
Judy Mitchell, Mission Resources Conservation District  
Marsi Steirer, City of San Diego  
Mark Thornton, San Elijo Joint Powers Authority  
Mark Weston, Helix Water District  
Ken Weinberg, San Diego County Water Authority  
Meena Westford, U.S. Department of Interior Bureau of Reclamation  
Dr. Richard Wright, Department of Geography, San Diego State University  
Susan Varty, Olivenhain Municipal Water District

**Attendance – RWMG Staff**

---

Dana Frieauf, San Diego County Water Authority  
Maria Mariscal, San Diego County Water Authority  
Sheri McPherson, County of San Diego  
Cecilia Padres, County of San Diego  
Cathy Pieroni, City of San Diego Water Department  
Jeff Pasek, City of San Diego Water Department  
Toby Roy, San Diego County Water Authority  
Jon Van Rhyn, County of San Diego

### **Attendance – Interested Parties to the RAC**

---

Grace Chan, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California  
Larry Johnson, Campo / Lake Morena Planning Group  
Kelly Hendrickson, Wild Animal Park  
Tom Richardson, RMC Water & Environment  
Persephene St. Charles, RMC Water & Environment  
Jeff Stephenson, San Diego County Water Authority  
Kate Streams, RMC Water & Environment  
Alyson Watson, RMC Water & Environment  
Michael Welch, Welch Consulting

### **Attendance – Public**

---

James A. Alexy, ESG (?)  
Peg Crilly

### **Introductions**

---

Ms. Kathleen Flannery welcomed RAC members to their fifth meeting. Brief introductions were made by all RAC members, consultants, and other members of the general public in attendance. Additionally, Ms. Flannery made the general comment that the Plan would be available to the RAC sooner rather than later so that there will be optimal time to review. It should be noted that today's comments may not be included in the upcoming draft, but will eventually be incorporated. The draft plan will include an electronic template with which to provide feedback. The preference is for initial comments to be provided in electronic template form by the next RAC meeting on April 23<sup>rd</sup>. However, the group acknowledged that this may not be feasible for all reviewers. Drafts of the Plan will be provided in hard copy form. If you do not want the hard copy form in order to save paper, please e-mail Mr. Jeff Stephenson and request the electronic version only.

### **Proposed Approach on Integration and Prioritization**

---

Ms. Alyson Watson (RMC Water & Environment) gave a presentation on the proposed approach to integration and prioritization.

- The integration process involves presenting the mix of water management strategies selected for inclusion in the Plan and discussing how these strategies work together to provide reliable water supply, protect or improve water quality, and achieve other objectives. A discussion of the added benefits of integration of multiple water management strategies should also be included in the Plan. The goal of Integration and Plan prioritization is to integrate projects to achieve objectives in each watershed.
- It is proposed that integration take place through a three-step process including: identification of water management strategies that address objectives; development of integration templates for each objective; and the tailoring of templates by watershed.
- Objectives are region-specific, while water management strategies are defined by the State (Prop 50). Plan prioritization will be flexible and inclusive, identifying primary and secondary water management strategies for each project and ranking projects by strategy and watershed. The funding application prioritization will be based on funding guidelines and will incorporate other criteria specific to the funding program.

RAC Member Comments and Responses:

- How will this approach look at groups of projects that have common impacts and how should plan projects be structured to address multiple needs? *Addressing common downstream impacts is a step away from where we are at this point and will depend on the approach that is adopted or agreed upon by the group.*
- How will this approach be affected by weighting objectives differently? *The model will work the same with either approach (equally-weighted or non equally-weighted objectives).*
- Requested clarification on the process including the difference between objectives and strategies. *All strategies tie back to objectives. Strategies are employed to meet objectives. Employing multiple strategies is good, but achieving multiple objectives is best. Prop 50 guidelines talk in terms of strategies so it is best to include this terminology in the Plan.*
- Will a project that achieves multiple objectives will be included within multiple integration templates? *Yes, if the group chooses to utilize this integration approach.*
- This approach is attempting to “marry” the strategies defined by the State and the regional objectives as decided upon by the RAC.
- Why does this approach only consider the integration of strategies, and not objectives? *This approach follows the Prop 50 guidelines, which require integration of water management strategies.*
- Projects that do not look at additional criteria may drop out of the mix.
- What happens if a project’s benefits occur within or across more than one watershed? Do they receive extra points? *That project will be associated with multiple watersheds, and may appear in multiple project groupings.*
- Stated that DWR has recommended the ability to leverage (i.e. build upon other projects) as part of the prioritization process. Others in the group concurred.
- When will the weighting/objectives discussion occur? *After Jon Van Rhyn’s presentation.*
- How will projects get ranked compared to other projects? *Projects will be ranked based on their internal integration as defined by the number of water management strategies they incorporate.*
- How will a project’s ability to achieve a strategy/objective/goal be determined? *At this point, the determination is binary – the strategy does or does not achieve an objective. The degree of benefit has not been included in the analysis.*
- Is this approach on integration and prioritization determined from scratch? *It was, but it flows from the State guidelines.*
- Will time sensitivity & readiness to proceed play into the weighting process? *They do not play a role in the process currently proposed at the Plan-level, but could be considered in the funding application-level prioritization process.*
- How will existing Plans and planning efforts within the Region be accounted for and evaluated for consistency? For example: Watershed Management Plans?
- Clarified that time sensitivity referred to urgency of the project (i.e. needed now, etc.) as opposed to readiness of the project.
- Certain priorities may be different for the plan than for the grant application itself.
- Brought up the sustainability concept to make the bigger picture. She discussed the use of alternate symbology to reflect benefits, disbenefits, and degree of benefit or disbenefit.

For example within Ms. Watson's presentation (slides 25/26) rather than X's and O's, the group could use large O's and small O's and large X's and small X's. O's would represent benefits and X's would represent disbenefits. The larger the O, the larger the benefit. Similarly, the larger the X, the larger the disbenefit. Currently there is no mention of disbenefits and it will be important to provide this information. *Disbenefits should be considered in the Impacts and Benefits section.*

- Add a discussion about the selected Prioritization and Ranking methodology and why it was selected within the Plan. .

### **Conclusions/Actions**

- The group will discuss the ranking of objectives after Mr. Jon Van Rhyn's presentation.

### **Summary of IRWM Objectives Ranking**

---

Mr. Jon Van Rhyn (County of San Diego) gave a presentation on the summary of the IRWM objectives ranking process. The Objectives Ranking Worksheet was distributed to all of the RAC members and completed by twenty three of twenty five members. The ten objectives were ranked in order of importance. It was noted that objectives A, B, and C are more process-oriented, while the remaining seven objectives are more outcome-oriented.

### **RAC Member Comments and Responses:**

- Comparing the ten objectives is like comparing apples and oranges.
- As a "lab test", every project would need to pass (or meet) the first three process-oriented objectives.
- Objective B should be screening material, but Objective C does not necessarily always apply.
- Group favors having Objectives A, B, and C as objectives of the Plan, and utilized in the prioritization process as minimum standards. Add this as an explanation within the Objectives chapter within the Plan.
- Disagreement regarding whether objective C should be a part of a litmus test or minimum standard.
- Objectives A-C are not really objectives, but stand alone projects.
- Objectives A-C are Plan objectives vs. the other objectives which are planning objectives.
- Show/explain the statistical variation between the rankings to determine whether differences in ranking are statistically significant.
- Concern regarding the wording of Objective F: it may be used narrowly and does not show or include the ways that water gets into the ground creating multiple benefits (i.e. habitats, watering, etc.).
- There would not be major differences within the statistical analysis.

### **Objectives of Facilitated Discussion**

---

Ms. Persephene St. Charles (RMC Water and Environment) reiterated the meeting objectives:

- Outline the Integration and Prioritization Approach that will be Presented in the Draft Plan
- Discuss Objectives
  - Identify Planning versus Implementation Objectives
  - Review the Objectives Ranking Results
  - Decide Whether to Present Objectives Ranking in the Draft Document
  - Determine whether to Use Objectives in Prioritization
- The group discussed whether to rank the objectives for the draft Plan. The group questioned how the rankings will affect prioritization. RMC reiterated that the proposed prioritization process did not utilize objective rankings, but that the objectives ranking could be used as an additional layer of prioritization.

### RAC Member Discussion:

- Wording of Objective F: should capture that a benefit of limiting hydromodification allows for water to get into the ground (recharge).
- Rating objectives could cause an “overweighting” problem and pull away from the big picture. What kind of rating scale will be used?
- Ranking forces projects to fall under certain criteria.
- Ranking can pigeon-hole projects; stay away from ranking based on Objectives.
- The ranking of objectives will force projects to ‘mold’ to fit an objective, and deceive the actual intent.
- Are there the same number of strategies per objective? If not, then the objectives are automatically ranked by default using the proposed ranking system.
- Utilize a statistical analysis where the top project-related strategies/objectives receive high points and the sub-strategies/objectives receive a lower-weighting system (i.e. 1.1, 1.2, etc.) may be useful.
- Need to evaluate qualitative vs. quantitative ways of ranking; not sure if objectives should be ranked at all.
- The objectives are an artifact of the RAC membership which appears to be weighted toward water supply; weighting the objectives could result in ranking towards the favor of water supply which may result in people’s opposition to the Plan.
- Some agree to ranking, but maybe a tiered approach should be pursued.
- Agreement with previous comment; a tiered approach should be based on a statistical analysis or something to recognize the differences in priorities.

- Using too much of a weighting system could gear the Plan towards focusing on only one type of outcome.
- Some type of ranking with small variables or tiers could be used to recognize some level of variability.
- What methods have been used in other Plans? *Stated that it depended on the group involved, but many previous plans were geared more specifically for Prop 50. This plan is designed with more built-in flexibility.*
- The Plan should be inclusive; balance project selection with meeting all objectives/goals.
- Note: DWR will be reviewing the Plan; this is something to remember/consider as their review will be important to the success of the Region in future funding.

### **Conclusions/Actions**

- The group voted on whether to rank the objectives using a tiered approach, or to proceed without ranking the objectives for the draft Plan. 14 members voted that that the Plan Objectives should not be ranked; 9 members voted for a tiered ranking system.
- Mr. Tom Richardson stated that due to the universal, process-oriented nature of Objective A, it is awkward for linking strategies. Mr. Richardson asked that the group collectively decide whether to utilize Objective A in the prioritization process. Mr. Richardson noted that the importance of Objective A will not be lost in the Plan.
- A consensus vote was taken to remove Objective A as a ranking criteria; Objective A will remain as a goal of the Plan. Mr. Michael Welch concurred and stated that Objective A is an overall goal of the plan.

### **Follow-up Items**

Ms. Frieauf discussed the State Board Meeting scheduled for March 20, 2007. The recommendation to shift funds to IRWMP grants has been made, but the group was not sure how much could be shifted. The funding meeting here went over the issues with Prop 84. The group discussed including Southern Orange County. Mr. Rob Hutsel passed out a handout from the Pro Prop 84 website that says \$91 million will be allocated to San Diego County for Integrated Regional Water Management. Ms. Susan Varty said that the regional group did include Southern Orange County and was previously brought in front of the board.

### **RAC Homework**

E-mail Mr. Stephenson if you do not want to receive a hard copy version of the draft Plan.

### **Next Meeting and Closing Remarks**

The next meeting is scheduled for April 23, 2007. There is a proposal to change the meeting time from 9:00-11:30 to 1:30-4:00. An e-mail will be sent out and the meeting will only be switched to the preference of the majority of the attendees. It was proposed that regularly scheduled meetings occur on the second Tuesday of every month at 9:00-11:30 starting June 12<sup>th</sup>, 2007 (there is a conflict with another meeting in Sacramento on May 8<sup>th</sup>, 2007).