Workgroup
Meeting #3 Notes

August 29, 2007, 8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Alvarado Treatment Plant – Training Room
5540 Kiowa Drive, La Mesa, CA 91942

Attendance – Primary

Rick Alexander, Sweetwater Authority (Water Retailers)
Kirk Ammerman, City of Chula Vista (Water Quality)
Kathy Flannery, County of San Diego (County of San Diego)
Karen Franz, Coastkeeper (At-Large)
Rob Hutsel, San Diego River Park Foundation (Natural Resources and Watersheds)
Megan Johnson, Southern CA Wetlands Recovery Project (Natural Resources and Watersheds)
Rob Roy, La Jolla Band of Luiseño Indians (At-Large)
Marsi Steirer, City of San Diego (City of San Diego)
Bob Yamada, San Diego County Water Authority (San Diego County Water Authority)

Attendance – Alternates and Consultants

Robyn Badger, San Diego Zoological Society (At-Large)
Neal Brown, Padre Dam Municipal Water District (Water Retailers)
Greg Krzys, United States Bureau of Reclamation (Natural Resources and Watersheds)
Sheri McPherson, County of San Diego (County of San Diego)
Jeff Pasek, City of San Diego (City of San Diego)
Mark Stadler, San Diego County Water Authority (San Diego County Water Authority)
Brett Kawakami, RMC Water and Environment
Alyson Watson, RMC Water and Environment

Introductions

Mr. Kirk Ammerman welcomed Workgroup members to their third meeting. Brief introductions were made. Nine voting members were present, representing a quorum. Four alternates were also present.

Reporting on External, Project-Related Discussions

Megan Johnson reported a conversation that she had with Dennis Bostad, Sweetwater Authority regarding Project #22 following the second Workgroup meeting. Ms. Johnson said that she had inquired whether the project could be considered planning rather than data gathering. Mr. Bostad had replied that he would go back to his staff and obtain feedback. Mr. Rick Alexander provided more information on the project and said that the project involves more than just planning. It will implement development of databases and mapping to support implementation of the Joint Water Agencies Natural Community Plan / Habitat Conservation Plan (JWA NCCP/HCP). Mr. Alexander also said that the $6M total cost listed for the project was incorrect and that the true cost would be approximately $900K.

Conclusions / Actions

- The Workgroup decided not to re-vote on Project #22 based on the new information until after the remaining projects had been voted upon.

Updates / Items for Discussion

Mr. Ammerman suggested that the Workgroup needs to determine how it will select projects. Once the Workgroup has developed the raw scores based on the program preferences voting, it will need to consider how to use these scores.

Project Discussion and Categorization, continued

To aid discussion and facilitate comparison of similar projects, the projects were organized into the following categories: water conservation, data development, education, groundwater management, invasive plant removal, land acquisition, land management, organization staffing/administration, recycled water, reliability (non-potable), reliability (potable), stormwater management, stormwater reuse, water quality improvement (potable), and wetlands enhancement.

Conclusions / Actions

- The process of discussing projects followed by voting on each project by program preference category continued. The voting results are shown in Attachment A.
- In general, projects that improved regional water supply were deemed to have served DAC needs.
- Organizational/staffing projects have the capacity to yield many benefits depending on the type of projects facilitated; these projects were not voted on and will be considered qualitatively.

Groundwater Management Projects

Project #14: El Monte Groundwater Recharge and River Restoration Project – Phases 1 and 2.

Discussion: This project will create new water, but this would be contingent upon the implementation of Project #45 (Santee Water Reclamation Facility Project). Responses to the following questions regarding the project were addressed by Mr. Neal Brown:

- What is the relationship between Project #14 and Project #45? *The intent is to use recycled water from the Santee Water Reclamation Facility for direct recharge of the El Monte Valley Basin.*
- How will the timing between the two projects work? *The El Monte Valley Basin can be recharged with raw water until the recycled water from Project #45 is available.*

Conclusions / Actions

See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Project #44: Santa Margarita Conjunctive Use.

Discussion: A question about this project was raised about whether it was an appropriate use of Prop 50 funds to resolve a conflict between a local and federal agency that would provide water

to the federal agency. A response was that a goal of Prop 50 is to resolve water rights disputes, however there was uncertainty about the limitations for a federal facility receiving funds. It was noted that the project would provide water to Camp Pendleton and Fallbrook Public Utilities District, which are both SDCWA member agencies. Responses to the following questions regarding the project were addressed by Mr. Greg Krzys:

- Will this resolve the existing water rights dispute? *Yes.*
- How likely are customers to comply to achieve the claimed benefits? *Our experience is that water users comply because they want to save money and be more efficient.*

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Project #46: South San Diego County Water Supply Strategy.

Discussion: Responses to the following questions regarding the project were addressed by Mr. Alexander:

- Is this project a study/data development project? *Yes, the project consists of a set of feasibility studies and it will make a determination of the resources that are available in the San Diego formation and how it can be used in a sustainable manner.*

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Invasive Plant Removal

General Points.

Discussion: Invasives use significantly more water than native plants, so their removal will increase local groundwater supply. The water supply benefits of invasives removal projects may depend on their location and proximity to pumps:

Project #19: Implementing Improvements to the Rose Creek Watershed: Controlling Invasive Exotic Species.

Discussion: The costs of this project (~$10K per acre) seemed relatively high relative to other invasives removal projects:

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Project #27: Northern San Diego County Invasive Non-Native Species Control Program.

Discussion: There are water supply facilities in the vicinity of the project.

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Project #48: Tijuana River Valley Invasive Plant Control Program – Phase 4.

Discussion: The project has the potential to reduce pollutant loading to the watershed, which lies in a very degraded area.

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Land Acquisition Projects

General Points.

Discussion: Mr. Jeff Pasek prepared an analysis of the land acquisition projects and their link to drinking source water protection. For land acquisition projects, more clarification on willing sellers is often needed.

Project #1: Acquiring Willow Glen Farm.

Discussion: The project is upstream of Sweetwater reservoir. The benefit to source water protection of the four acres proposed for purchased in this project would depend on the specific location.

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Project #9: Conservation in the Campo Valley.

Discussion: This project would protect groundwater for residents of Campo Valley, who rely mainly on groundwater supplies.

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Project #11: Dulzura Creek Source Water Protection through Property Acquisition and Habitat Restoration.

Discussion: The range of costs is significant.

- Why is there such a range on costs? *The specific parcels and willing sellers have not been identified.*

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Project #13: El Capitan Reservoir Watershed Acquisition Program.

Discussion: No significant discussion.

Conclusions / Actions

See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Project #15: Green – San Dieguito.

Discussion: The water supply that would be protected by this project is between Lake Hodges and Elijo lagoon.

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Project #24: Las Californias Binational Conservation Initiative: A Vision for Habitat Conservation and Watershed Protection.

Discussion: This project would acquire properties that are currently used for sand mining. The properties are upstream of Barrett Reservoir.

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Project #29: Preserving the Peutz Valley Watershed.

Discussion: The acquisition location was discussed.

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Project #30: Ramona Grasslands.

Discussion: The project would reduce sediment loading to Hodges Reservoir, which is impaired for turbidity. Hodges Reservoir will soon serve the region to the south of the reservoir, as part of the Emergency Storage Project.

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Project #34: Rutherford Ranch acquisition of 1,689 acres on Volcan Mountain.

Discussion: The project could reduce pollution to Lake Sutherland, which is impaired but is not currently used as a drinking water source.

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Project #35: Sage Hills Open Space Acquisition.

Discussion: There are no drinking water reservoirs that would be protected by this project. The project would improve water quality in San Elijo lagoon.

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Project #37: San Diego National Wildlife Refuge – Otay Unit Land & Crestridge Linkage Acquisition.

Discussion: The project would acquire lands upstream of Otay and Sweetwater Reservoirs. The costs seem very high – the $60M shown is the cost to build out the National Wildlife Refuge, while the project would focus on acquisition of key parcels. Willing sellers have been identified.

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Project #43: San Vicente Reservoir Source Protection through Watershed Property Acquisition.

Discussion: This project will protect against future pollution, but would not reduce pollution to an impaired water body.

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Land Management Projects

Project #41: San Diego Water Department Cornerstone Lands Management and Source Water Protection.

Discussion: This project will protect water quality in drinking water reservoirs. A point was made that the lands being acquired are MSCP lands and so the City is legally obligated to fund their purchase. A response to this was that there is nothing to preclude the seeking of funds for this – stormwater projects are similar in that they are required by law, but grant funds can still be obtained. The project would protect the reservoirs from the impacts of off-road vehicle recreation.

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Organization Staffing/Administration Projects

General Points.

Discussion: Organization staffing is not excluded from Prop 50, however such projects may not be the strongest candidates. These projects should be tied into other projects in the watershed. One important aspect of these projects are that they help build stakeholder support through citizen participation. They can also help to address DAC and EJ concerns and the associated scoring criteria.

Conclusions / Actions
The Workgroup decided to postpone discussion of these projects and revisit this category later with an eye towards bundling with other projects:

Project #36: San Diego Rural Community Watershed Councils (primarily targeting inland areas not served by CWA/MWD infrastructure).

Project #40: San Diego River Watershed Coordinator.

Project #42 San Dieguito Watershed Council Staffing.

Recycled Water Projects

General Points.

Discussion: The following questions were considered for all recycled water projects during assessment:

- Does the project help with reservoir augmentation?
- Can the project help reduce treated wastewater flows to the ocean?
- Will the project reduce flows to an impaired water body?

Project #7: City of San Diego Parklands Recycled Water Retrofit and Distribution System.

Discussion: The Responses to questions were provided by Ms Marsi Steirer. The following questions were raised regarding the project:

- How do Project #7 and Project #26 work together? *Project #26 completes a gap in the distribution system. Project #7 retrofits parks that are adjacent to the recycled water line.*
- Can you implement Project #7 if you don't have Project #26? *Yes, they affect different parts of the system.*

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Project #26: North City Recycled Water Distribution System Expansion – Phase II.

Discussion: See above.

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Project #32: Recycled Water Retrofit Assistance Program.

Discussion: See above.

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Project #33: Recycled Water System Improvements.

Discussion: See above.

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Project #45: Santee Water Reclamation Facility Expansion Project.

Discussion: Responses to questions were provided by Mr. Neal Brown. The following question was raised regarding the project:

- Does this project include the pipeline to the groundwater recharge area? *No, this is only for the treatment facility.*

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Project #47: Tertiary Wastewater Treatment Upgrade.

Discussion: Responses to questions were provided by Ms. Robyn Badger. The following question was raised regarding the project:

- How does the project increase water supply? *The water created by this project will replace potable use.*

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Reliability (Non-Potable) Projects

Project #31: Recycled Water and Groundwater Storage Facility Project.

Discussion: The project provides non-potable system reliability, allowing potential reductions in the use of potable supplies for nonpotable uses.

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Project #49: Valley Well Improvement Project.

Discussion: Improving the Valley Well pump system will allow the Wild Animal Park to provide redundancy for the well water system.

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Reliability (Potable) Projects

General Points.

Discussion: Drinking water supply can be considered a beneficial use for purposes of determining if projects will assist in expeditiously and measurably to long-term attainment and maintenance of water quality standards.

Project #3: Carlsbad Desalination Project Local Conveyance.

Discussion: The lowering of TDS was considered a water quality benefit. However, the issue of brine management was also raised as a concern.

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Project #38: San Diego Four Reservoir Intertie Project Feasibility Study.

Discussion: The project could increase the capability to store and manage imported water in four San Diego County reservoirs, making the region more resistant to drought and water delivery service interruptions.

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Stormwater Management Projects

General Points.

Discussion: The stormwater projects proposed would not offer many water supply benefits except for some limited benefits in demand reduction (e.g. landscaping). Although the projects are demonstration projects, they would provide insight and information on implementation of projects in the San Diego Region. For example, the projects could help provide information on potential impacts to land stability. The projects would also serve as models for similar projects in the future.

Project #4: City of San Diego Green Mall Porous Paving and Infiltration, Phase 1.

Discussion: See above.

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Project #5: City of San Diego Green Street Porous Paving and Infiltration, Phase 1.

- Discussion: See above.

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Project #8: City of San Diego Watershed-Based Street Sweeping Program, Phase 1.

- Discussion: See above.

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Project #10: County of San Diego Chollas Creek Runoff Reduction and Groundwater Recharge Project.

Discussion: The City and County projects for the Chollas Creek are both elements of a master plan for Chollas Creek.

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Project #23: La Jolla Shores Ocean Protection Project.

Discussion: Porous pavement near beaches may not make sense.

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Stormwater Reuse Projects

Project #2: Capture and Reuse Stormwater Runoff from Visitor Parking Lot Project.

Discussion: Responses to questions were provided by Ms. Badger. The following questions were raised regarding the project:

- What are the impairments at Hodges Reservoir? *Nitrogen, phosphorus, color, manganese, turbidity, and pH.*

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Project #6: City of San Diego Municipal Rooftop Rain Harvesting, Phase 1.

Discussion: The project would install rooftop rain harvesting devices, i.e., rain barrels, at select City of San Diego municipal facilities to capture roof rain water for use in landscape irrigation.

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Water Quality Improvement Projects

Project #16: Reservoir Hodges Water Quality Improvements Plan.

Discussion: Hodges Reservoir is an impaired water body. This project will address the internal cycle of pollutants within the reservoir. The reservoir will also impact water supply outside the reservoir when it is tie into the Emergency Storage Project.

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Wetlands Enhancement Projects

General Points.

Discussion: The two projects in this category could benefit from integration.

Project #20: Implementing Improvements to the Rose Creek Watershed: Controlling Invasive Exotic Species.

Discussion: The location of the project and downstream beneficial uses were discussed.

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Project #51: Wetland Expansion Science and Technology Against Runoff (WESTAR II).

Discussion: The location of the project and downstream beneficial uses were discussed.

Conclusions / Actions
See **Attachment A** for results of preliminary assessment.

Proposal Framework Discussion

The Workgroup discussed the general framework for the proposal. Ms. Watson discussed the Prop 50 Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) scoring criteria. The following general principles were set forth by the RAC.

- Choose projects that are complementary.
- Build a package initially around water supply and reliability and then add projects that can enhance those projects.
- Select projects that can help meet all the Plan objectives.

It was recognized that given the limit on available funding, there may be a tradeoff between geographic diversity and selecting projects that are complementary.

The Workgroup decided to select an initial set of core projects (anchor projects) to form the basis for a proposal package. A general guideline for breakdown of funding in the package was suggested as $10M for the core projects, $5M for projects that support the core projects as well as offering other benefits, and $10M for other projects that met other overarching regional objectives.

Preliminary Proposal Development

The Workgroup decided to nominate and vote on projects to include in the package based on the individual project discussions, results of program preference voting and the desire to form a well-integrated proposal that addressed multiple Plan objectives. To be included in the proposal, projects were evaluated for how they contributed to the overall package, as well as the results of the program preference voting scores. The threshold for voting to be included in the preliminary proposal package was 5 votes (out of 9 Workgroup members). The projects listed below represent this preliminary set of projects to be carried forward for further consideration.

The Workgroup developed a set of five “anchor” projects for initial consideration. The “anchor” projects are water supply reliability projects that provide good opportunities for developing synergies with other projects. Two projects (#14 and #45) will be combined into one anchor project.

The Workgroup then selected projects that directly supported these anchor projects. Water Conservation and Recycled Water Projects were considered to form programs. Other projects that did not necessarily directly support anchor projects or programs were then nominated based on their ability to further the IRWM objectives.

Anchor projects

Project #38: San Diego Four Reservoir Intertie Project Feasibility Study

Project #14: El Monte Valley Groundwater Recharge and River Restoration Project

Project #45: Santee Water Reclamation Facility Expansion Project

Project #44: Santa Margarita Conjunctive Use Project

Project #3 Carlsbad Desalination Project Local Conveyance

Support Projects

Project #13: El Capitan Reservoir Watershed Acquisition Program (Supports #38, #14 and #45)

Project #43: San Vicente Reservoir Source Protection through Watershed Property Acquisition (Supports # 38)

Project #40: San Diego River Watershed Coordinator (Supports #38, #14 and #45)

Water Conservation Program

Project #17: Implementation of Agricultural Efficiency Programs

Project #18: Implementation of Integrated Landscape Program

Project #21: Integrated Commercial/Industrial/Institutional and Residential Indoor Conservation Programs

Project #28: Over-Irrigation Runoff/Bacteria Reduction Project

Recycled Water Program

Project #26: North City Recycled Water Distribution System Expansion-Phase II

Project #32: Recycled Water Retrofit Assistance Program

Other Projects

Project #4: City of San Diego Green Mall Porous Paving and Infiltration, Phase 1

Project #6: City of San Diego Municipal Rooftop Rain Harvesting, Phase 1

Project #7: City of San Diego Parklands Recycled Water Retrofit and Distribution System

Project #9: Conservation in the Campo Valley

Project #12: Educational Demonstration Wetland Project

Project #22: Joint Water Agency Natural Community Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan (JWA NCCP/HCP)/ Initial Implementation

Project #27: Northern San Diego County Invasive Non-Native Species Control Program

Project #39: San Diego Regional Water Quality Assessment and Outreach Project

Project #46: South San Diego County Water Supply Strategy

Action Items for Next Meeting

RMC will develop a list of assignments for Workgroup members to contact project proponents to determine the minimum level of funding needed to allow the projects to move forward.

Schedule

The next meeting will be held on Friday, September 7 from 8am to 5pm at the San Diego County Water Authority.