Regional Advisory Committee
Meeting #10 Notes
August 1, 2007, 9:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
San Diego County Water Authority
4677 Overland Avenue, San Diego, CA   92123

Attendance – RAC Members

Craig Adams, San Dieguito River Valley Conservancy
Kirk Ammerman, City of Chula Vista
Michael Bardin, Santa Fe Irrigation District
Dennis Bostad, Sweetwater Authority
Michael Connolly, Campo Kumeyaay Nation
Neal Brown, Padres Dam Municipal Water District
Kathleen Flannery, County of San Diego
Linda Flournoy, Sustainability Consultant
Doug Gibson, San Elijo Lagoon Conservancy
Rob Hutsel, San Diego River Park Foundation
Jim Peugh, on behalf of Megan Johnson, Southern California Wetlands Recovery Project
Marsi Steirer, City of San Diego
Shelby Tucker, San Diego Association of Governments
Mark Umphres on behalf of Mark Weston, Helix Water District
Susan Varty, Olivenhain Municipal Water District
Mark Weston, Helix Water District

Attendance – RWMG Staff

Maria Mariscal, San Diego County Water Authority
Sheri McPherson, County of San Diego
Cecilia Padres, County of San Diego
Mark Stadler, San Diego County Water Authority
Toby Roy, San Diego County Water Authority
Jon Van Rhyn, County of San Diego

Attendance – Interested Parties to the RAC

Rick Alexander, Sweetwater Authority
Brett Kawakami, RMC Water and Environment
Greg Krzys, United States Bureau of Reclamation
Christine Sloan, County of San Diego
Alyson Watson, RMC Water and Environment
Michael Welch, Michael R. Welch Consulting

Attendance – Public

Robyn Badger, San Diego Zoo
Dave Stout, Back Country Land Trust

Introductions

Ms. Kathleen Flannery (Chairperson) welcomed Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) members to their tenth meeting. Brief introductions were made by all RAC members, consultants, and other members of the general public in attendance.

Step 1 Application

Ms. Alyson Watson (RMC Water and Environment) indicated that the Region would be submitting the Step 1 application that day and applauded the efforts of the RAC and Regional Water Management Group (RWMG). The Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan was developed in great part thanks to the efforts of the RAC. The San Diego Water Authority (SDCWA) adopted a public draft of the Plan on July 26, which will improve the scoring of the Plan.

The Step 1 application consists of four required attachments. Attachment 1 is the actual Plan itself and the proof of adoption. The other three attachments contain information to assist reviewers in locating key information in the Plan that will be evaluated and scored. Attachment 2 is titled Consistency with Minimum Plan IRWM Plan Standards. This attachment shows how the Plan meets minimum standards. The ability of the Plan to adequately address these criteria is a pass-fail test. Criteria evaluated include: participation of at least three agencies (two of which have statutory authority over water management), a regional map, documentation of regional objectives and integration of water management strategies, project prioritization, a project schedule and a map of projects. Attachment 3 is entitled Consistency with IRWM Plan Standards. This attachment directs reviewers to portions of the Plan that will be scored. The Plan was written so that each section (Sections A-O) addresses a corresponding set of criteria in the Step 1 Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) guidelines for scoring. Attachment 3 identifies sections in the Plan that contain specific information and briefly describes how the criteria are addressed in the Plan. Attachment 4 is entitled Disadvantaged Communities and Environmental Justice and describes how the Plan addresses issues of disadvantaged communities and environmental justice. The process of preparing the Step 2 application will begin in August.

RAC Member Comments and Responses:
- Where is the application available to be viewed? *It will be available on the DWR website and we will put it on the Project Clean Water website.*

Conclusions/Actions
None

Upcoming Schedule

The August 14 RAC meeting is intended to be used to review public comments and come to conclusions on how comments should be addressed in the final Plan. As there are many RAC meetings and Workgroup meetings scheduled in August, the RAC was asked whether the August 14 RAC meeting should be canceled.

It was suggested that the consultant team determine how to address comments and send it out to the RAC for review, recognizing that the Plan needs to be finalized by September as there is no San

Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) board meeting in November, necessitating adoption of the Plan in October.

Mr. Michael Welch (Michael R. Welch Consulting) will be taking the lead in addressing the comments. Mr. Welch said that out of the comments received, approximately 60% could be classified as asking for additional information that was omitted or for addressing additional needs, 20% were requests for clarification and 20% were in disagreement of an item in the Plan. The comments overall were helpful and will lead to a stronger Plan.

Mr. Welch said that he will prepare initial responses to comments this week and provide the results to the RWMG. The RWMG will review these initial responses Monday.

RAC Member Comments and Responses:
- How many public comments were there on the Plan? *There were over 100 comments on the Plan received from 16 individuals.*
- What is the timeframe to get draft responses? How much time will we have to look at the comments/responses before August 14? *Michael Welch will perform the first draft this week and get them out to the RWMG. The RWMG will review the comments and the approach to responses this Monday.*
- The August 14th date has already been reserved by many folks in the RAC, we should keep the date and utilize it for a Workgroup meeting even if it is not used for addressing public comments. *We will discuss Workgroup scheduling briefly following the RAC meeting – this is an excellent suggestion.*
- I would prefer not to meet [on August 14] unless there is a reason to. *We do prefer to get the input of the group. Sometimes it is helpful to get the RAC together. The meeting would be useful to work out the 20% of comments that disagreed with some elements in the Plan. The Plan will be better if the RAC has a chance to address comments, which could be categorized for review.*
- We have consultants, let's have the RWMG review the responses to the comments, then send these out to the RAC. After this process, maybe there won't be many comments left. We can always put this on the agenda of a September meeting if necessary.

Conclusions/Actions
There will be no RAC meeting on August 14. The consultant team will propose responses to the public comments, which will be reviewed by the RWMG. The proposed responses will be emailed to the RAC members, who will provide feedback at the September 5 RAC meeting, if necessary.

Workgroup

Ms. Watson said that the list of projects in the Draft Plan has now been rescored and reprioritized after incorporating comments received from project proponents. A revised Tier 1 list was developed and then screened with Prop 50 criteria. The three screening items were:

- Project proponent has requested consideration for Prop 50 funding
- CEQA/NEPA scheduled to be complete by December 2008 (if applicable)
- Watershed management or flood protection projects must have an implementation component

Ms. Watson reviewed the composition of the Workgroup and said that alternates were still needed for Natural Resources and Watersheds and for Members-At-Large. Possibilities had been identified, but scheduling needed to be completed. Mr. Rob Roy (La Jolla Indian Reservation) was named as one of the possible representatives for Members-At-Large, however his acceptance of the nomination was contingent upon approval of his board. My Roy received endorsements from RAC members who have worked with him in the past.

Ms. Watson said that during the last meeting, the RAC revised ground rules. Ms. Watson reviewed the ground rules and highlighted the following points:

- Members will be empowered to make decisions and will decide how to present recommendations.
- A quorum is defined as more than half of the Workgroup members (5 out of 9) and will be required to conduct a meeting.
- Participation is limited to members, consultants and topical experts. Topical experts may also be alternates. Topical experts will answer technical questions if asked.
- The schedule will attempt to leave room between meetings for obtaining relevant information and/or clarification from project proponents.
- Members can contact external parties, but must report any contacts to the group. These will be made available on meeting notes on website.
- If all except one Workgroup member agree that a project which is not in Tier 1 should be added to the list for Workgroup consideration, then it can be added.
- Workgroup members should not discuss / advocate for their own projects.
- Scores of the projects from the initial ranking will not be provided to Workgroup members.
- Members may contact proponents to modify projects.

Ms. Watson said that Workgroup members will receive a bag and notebook donated by the City, with pens and a binder donated by the County. They will also receive project abstracts with 100 word descriptions and the application forms that were submitted by the proponents. The topics of the four Workgroup meetings will be as follows:

- Meeting 1: Review workshop purpose, structure and ground rules. Choose a spokesperson. Discuss projects.
- Meeting 2: Review projects and with project-based evaluation criteria and nominate projects for inclusion in the funding package.
- Meeting 3: Develop $25M package and evaluate with proposal criteria and revise as necessary. Identify opportunities to modify or combine projects that can be discussed with proponents prior to Meeting 4.
- Meeting 4: Finalize the $25M proposal package.
- Extra Meeting: There are provisions for an extra meeting, if necessary.

Ms. Watson reviewed a series of project statistics. After comments were received, the number of projects was reduced from 162 to 160. Project scores were revised based on comments and the 50th percentile cutoff score increased from 51 to 62. There are now a total of 73 projects in Tier 1. After applying the screening criteria discussed earlier, the number of projects that will be considered for Prop 50 funding dropped to 50. An email was sent out to project proponents asking them to verify their ability to meet the contract requirements that will be imposed by the state. Projects were not removed based on responses to this inquiry, as we talked to a DWR representative who indicated that there is flexibility in meeting certain requirements. Ms. Watson showed a set of slides that

broke down the 50 projects being considered by type, location, benefits, and objectives addressed. She pointed out that there were a variety of project proponents. Land acquisition represented the largest number of projects. The project map shows projects with point locations and those which are spread across different areas. There is a good distribution across Hydrologic Units. The majority of projects are implementation projects, although there are some pilot/demonstration projects and studies. This material will be presented at the August 14 public workshop (5-6 pm at SDCWA).

<u>RAC Member Comments and Responses:</u>

- Is the schedule for the September 19th meeting the same? *Yes. It will be from 9:00 to 11:30 AM.*
- Are you still looking for natural resources and members at large representatives? *We are looking for an alternate for Natural Resources and Watersheds.*
- Will proponents be advised that they will not be included? *Yes*
- I thought we agreed on a voting procedure that required one vote from each area. We did go back and forth on the topic. *The agreed upon standard for acceptance of the final application package was 6 out of 9 votes.*
- Can we bring up this topic on voting again? *This was already voted on at the last meeting. Concerns expressed about this issue were recorded in the Meeting #9 Notes, as requested.*
- We should say that proponents will not vote on their own projects.
- Should we also say that proponent should not be in room? I think it is in spirit of allowing open discussion that a proponent should not be in the room.
- I thought we agreed that it would be useful for person to be in room to answer questions.
- There is a provision to contact project proponents outside the meetings, and the same should apply to proponents that are members of the Workgroup.
- Will there be a quorum if project proponent cannot vote? If we need 6 of 9 to agree and there are more than 3 proponents, then there would not be a quorum. *It would be an issue once the package is being developed.*
- [In this discussion] there is some confusion between discussion of projects and voting on the proposal package. For the proposal package approval, I agree that all Workgroup members need to be there. But for discussion of projects, I think it's a good idea for project proponents to leave the room and be called back if any questions arise (i.e. similar to what would occur with non-Workgroup proponents).
- I thought there would be voting on which projects will go into proposal. *There will be nominations. During the last meeting, the RAC agreed that it wanted to give the Workgroup broad latitude. The Workgroup will only be formally voting on the proposal.*
- I think simply having Workgroup members avoid discussing their own projects is fine. Otherwise, people will be leaving the room constantly. It will dilute the process. If we choose members, we should trust them. *This is all good discussion and is a continuation of July 10. However, we are uncomfortable about adding new revision to decisions that we already decided upon. We have 5 less people than we did during the last meeting and would prefer to leave it the way it had been previously decided.*
- I agree that a Workgroup member can't nominate their own project to get into the proposal. We have to get $116M worth of projects down to $25M. But there is a formal vote to approve the package.

- I am confident that group members we selected will act correctly. We should leave it up to the Workgroup and should not micromanage.
- For Meeting 2, we should have the Workgroup develop a numerical rating, similar to the procedure used to develop the initial rankings. The Workgroup should develop an objective method to support package.
- I am concerned about penalizing agencies that participate by excluding them from voting. It still takes entire group to agree. So, I think with the set of people that we have it will be a clean process. Having Workgroup members not be able to vote is like a penalty. I agree with idea not to discuss projects unless asked.
- The key thing to remember is that the Workgroup will go to RAC for approval. There will be project nomination and package approval by the Workgroup and then final approval by the RAC. When the RWMG first started, it wanted the RAC to have real power and entrusted it with decision making authority. Similarly, the Workgroup will have done a lot of reading and will have sat through 16 hours and read through projects So, the RAC should respect WG decisions, but if the RAC detects something amiss they reserve the right to question the results. Ultimately the RAC should trust the Workgroup to develop a sound package.
- As I see it, the role of the Workgroup is akin to a committee in the Senate. The Workgroup will pare down the projects, put them into a package and make a recommendation to the RAC, which will then take a final vote on the recommendation. If this is what is on the table, then that seems reasonable.
- No where does it say that the Workgroup will work towards a package for $25M. *We will make sure that the criteria indicates a $25M package is the goal.*
- Will the projects within the $25M package be prioritized? *No.*
- What is the expectation for the maximum grant amount? *Anywhere between $0 and $25M*
- Should we apply for more funds beyond $25M? *$25M is the maximum we request*
- Prop 84 requirements may be different – will we start the process all over again? *Yes*
- From the minutes of the RAC last meeting, the $25M was not mentioned, so we should put $25M into guidelines.
- Large complex projects (such as some large water supply projects) will be hurt by the CEQA criteria, as they will not be able to meet the criteria. We don't want to give the impression that a project is not a good project because it can't meet these requirements. *The criteria reflect a State requirement, so this may not be the right funding opportunity for projects unable to meet this criterion.*
- Some projects must have CEQA? *Yes, All projects have already been screened to have CEQA done by December 31, 2008.*
- It's not clear where the next pool of projects [beyond the current 50 Workgroup projects] is to draw from. *We aren't encouraging the Workgroup to look through other list, but if someone is aware of project, they can bring it up.*
- Is there a limitation on the duration of a project? *The guidance is that state does not want to have projects last for more than 5 years, but that is not a screening criteria.*
- Why does the Schedule criterion require that projects be ready to proceed by June 2008? *We want to choose projects that are ready to go. The actual language contained in the Workgroup Project-Level criteria is looser – "Strive to choose projects". The bottom*

> *line is that although all projects can potentially be included, the proposal will be stronger if projects are ready to go*

- Can you send out the Workgroup guidelines? *Yes.*
- Have you checked with proponents to see if they will be ready to go? We have had problems in the past with this. *That is a step that we will take once projects have been identified. We will check facts at that point.*
- What do the projects add up to? *$400M total, $116M in requested funds.*
- When you show project costs – that is the total? *Yes*
- For clarification, the green dots are projects with point locations, and hatch marks are projects that occur over an area? *Yes*
- I thought the project statistics presentation was a great presentation of data. The level of information provided helps us explain importance of plan. I recommend changing the color of the green dots, as they are hard to see.

Conclusions/Actions

- The RAC decided to leave the ground rules on voting as agreed upon during the previous RAC Meeting.

The Workshop Purpose, Structure and Ground Rules will be revised as soon as possible and distributed for review by the RAC.

Updates

Ms. Christine Sloan gave a presentation on Low Impact Development (LID). Ms. Sloan began by saying that she had recently read through the San Diego IRWM Plan and was pleased in how LID was represented in the Plan. LID decreases runoff by treating it at the source and mimicking natural hydrologic function. There is a common misperception about LID. LID is neither smart growth, conservation design, nor green building (although it can be a component of these). The County's recently developed LID Handbook is currently undergoing public review and comments are being accepted.

Mr. Mark Stadler gave a presentation on the current state of State Water Project operations.

RAC Member Comments and Responses:

- What is not usually acknowledged is how development affects ambient soil moisture. Impervious surfaces are drying out the soil, increasing earthquake prone. As LID increases, soils will return to natural state, so underground problems will be mitigated.
- What is the issue with the effects of Delta pumping? Are fish getting sucked in, or does the operation change flows? *Both are important.*
- The projections show 6-15% for desalination. What is going on with negotiations with power plant? *The power plant is going forward on its own.*
- If power plant goes to dry cooling, Poseidon cannot piggyback on the power plant's EIR. *The Poseidon plant is only one of three potential desalination plants that may move forward in the Region, so even without that facility, desalination is projected to be part of the future supply portfolio.*

- I noticed that the projections for recycled water seem smaller than from previous projections. *The numbers presented only reflect SDCWA, rather than the region.*

<u>Conclusions/Actions</u>

An email will be sent to the RAC providing information on the review of the County of San Diego Low Impact Development Handbook.

The next RAC meeting will be held on September 5 from 9:00-11:30 am.

Public Comments

- Robin Badger (San Diego Zoo): How many RAC members are on the Workgroup? Can a list be published of what projects they have an interest in? *Yes*
- Dave Stout (Back County Land Trust): Thank you for work – we submitted 4 projects and they are included in short list of projects. I will be happy to work with the Workgroup to answer questions.
- Robin Badger (San Diego Zoo): If the RAC committee representatives on the Workgroup can vote for their projects, then it seems that they have one automatic vote. I would like to submit my name for the Workgroup. *Please provide your name to Alyson.*