Regional Advisory Council
Meeting #9 Notes
July 10, 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
Rick Alexander on behalf of Dennis Bostad, Sweetwater Authority
Meleah Ashford, Consultant to the City of Encinitas
Chris Basilevac, The Nature Conservancy
Michael Connolly, Campo Kumeyaay Nation
Neal Brown, Padres Dam Municipal Water District
Kathleen Flannery, County of San Diego
Linda Flournoy, Sustainability Consultant
Judy Mitchell, Mission Resources Conservation District
Rob Hutsel, San Diego River Park Foundation
Eric Larson, Farm Bureau of San Diego County
Marsi Steirer, City of San Diego
Mike Thornton, San Elijo Joint Powers Authority
Shelby Tucker, San Diego Association of Governments
Mark Umphres on behalf of Mark Weston, Helix Water District
Ken Weinberg, San Diego County Water Authority
T. Whitaker on behalf of Dr. Richard Wright, Department of Geography, San Diego State University
Susan Varty, Olivenhain Municipal Water District

Attendance – RWMG Staff

Mark Stadler, San Diego County Water Authority
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

Brett Kawakami, RMC Water and Environment
Tom Richardson, RMC Water and Environment
Persephene St. Charles, RMC Water and Environment
Alyson Watson, RMC Water and Environment
Leslie Cleveland on behalf of Meena Westford, United States Bureau of Reclamation

Attendance – Public

Robyn Badger, San Diego Zoo
Peg Crilly
Diana Hussey, Resource Conservation District of Greater San Diego
Larry Johnson, Campo/Lake Marina Planning Group
Marty Leavitt, Resource Conservation District of Greater San Diego
Laura Lindemayer, Brown and Caldwell
Katherine Lowry, Brown and Caldwell

Introductions

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

Public Outreach Plan

Ms. Alyson Watson discussed the Public Outreach Plan. The Outreach Plan is located in Appendix 8 of the Public Draft San Diego Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (Draft Plan). The objectives of the discussion were to review the Outreach Plan and to obtain feedback and suggestions from the RAC on the planned public outreach efforts. The team requesred the RAC's ideas on elements and/or actions missing from the Outreach Plan, as well as contacts that RAC members maintain within the community and assistance members could provide in implementing outreach efforts.

The Outreach Plan contains four components: stakeholder coordination, public involvement, disadvantaged communities' assistance and environmental justice identification.

The goal of stakeholder coordination is to engage targeted entities with interest and/or authority in water management such as cities, water retailers, regulatory agencies, community groups and organizations with interests in water quality, agricultural, recreation, and the environment. Outreach activities may consist of meetings and focus groups and communications will be maintained through email lists and the San Diego IRWM website.

The public involvement component is different than stakeholder coordination as it focuses on increasing awareness, understanding and support of members of the general public, including policymakers. Two workshops have been held so far. The first workshop focused on most recent workshop provided an introduction to the Draft Plan, and reviewed the process for scoring projects in the Draft Plan. The purpose of the next workshop will be to review the public comments received on the IRWM, and to discuss how comments will be incorporated into future versions of the Plan. After this meeting, a bimonthly schedule will be adopted. A wide variety of communication tools will be utilized to maximize public participation to include emails, flyers, announcements and local news coverage.

Ms. Watson discussed the anticipated approach to environmental justice identification and outreach. The goals of this component are to identify environmental justice groups and to learn what their needs are. Identification of environmental justice issues is an area where much work is needed. Identification of these issues will allow them to be addressed through Plan implementation. Some

organizations representing environmental justice issues that have been identified are Coastkeeper, and the Environmental Health Coalition. Ms. Watson presented a schedule for working with these organizations to develop solutions to the identified environmental justice issues, develop a project review process, and broaden understanding of the benefits and impacts of IRWM planning on environmental justice communities. The Public Outreach Plan also calls for the invitation of an environmental justice organization to be represented on the RAC.

The final component of the Public Outreach Plan is Disadvantaged Communities (DAC) Assistance. The goal of DAC Assistance is to identify and engage DACs who may face certain constraints to participate. Ms. Watson stated that an important issue is examining how the state defines DACs and determining whether that definition truly captures the DACs that exist within the Region. A number of outreach activities are planned, including contacting DAC leaders, holding public meetings in DAC areas, and making proactive efforts to encourage meeting attendance by DACs. A schedule for DAC outreach was presented. Ms. Watson said that the Public Outreach Plan called for direct communications and one-on-one contact with DAC leaders through phone calls and office visits as an effective means to gain DAC participation.

Ms. Watson concluded the discussion by saying that the RAC may have already engaged in some of these areas and that any advice on what has worked would be appreciated. Ms. Flannery emphasized the importance of successful implementation of the Public Outreach Plan. She asked the RAC members to put their thoughts into how outreach can be improved.

RAC Member Comments and Responses:
- Outreach to state board and legislators, and county supervisors was left out. One issue that the Region has faced is we haven't had much legislative power. We need to build a strong case for the Region.
- The Public Outreach Plan was thorough, but the role of RAC is not clear. Is there a role for RAC? What are the expectations for the RAC? *We understand that the RAC members are busy. One important area where the RAC can assist is in helping us reach out to their customers, constituents, and stakeholders. We will be happy to have RAC participate at whatever level they can achieve.*
- RAC members have resources that can be utilized for public outreach with significant mailing lists. Another important consideration is to determine who is delivering a particular message for a specific topic (e.g. recycled water).
- There must also be an appropriate approach to understanding and respecting culture as you conduct outreach. For instance, there are different cultures among tribes.
- My concern is that we are not creating a new voice, as it seems there are already too many voices. We don't need another voice unless there is a clear void that needs to be filled. We can give existing forums the tools and messages to carry to their groups, but the message should come from them.
- Personally, I haven't seen IRWMP notices. We do not seem to be reaching the general public with notices.
- I agree that we need to take a one-on-one approach to be effective with community leaders. However, I didn't see any actions to coordinate with watershed groups.
- We need to have a mechanism for sharing lessons learned.

- Can you provide the definition of a DAC? *The Proposition 50 definition is a census tract with a median household income below 80% of the statewide median household income.*
- An important component relative to disadvantaged communities is environmental justice – communities need a voice so that they don't end up with a project that they don't want, or pollutants resulting from those projects.
- The definition of environmental justice doesn't make sense - is it environmental laws, regulations or policies that cause the trouble? *The definition is confusing. In general, laws and regulations are intended to prevent things like this from happening. However, one way that laws and regulations can actually cause problems is if they cause projects to be implemented, and the projects being implemented are placed in areas where they then cause disproportionate impacts.*
- How do you engage DACs? We need to ask them what their priorities are. This is very critical. And it is not just who you talk to, but what you present them with and what you ask them to do. In other words, don't ask them which projects they need as they may not even know at this point. They need to be able to relate. *The point is not to start by asking what projects they want, but to first identify critical needs. Most likely, the needs are location specific. We can then work with them to determine if there is a project that is needed to address the needs and help develop the project, or identify existing projects that can help meet the need.*
- We need to talk finances and what can we offer to DACs. You are asking DACs to develop projects but they cannot afford them. We need to focus instead on how do you improve a watershed - how can we make it better. *One option for providing financial assistance within a grant application is that the RAC could decide to provide 100% funding for a DAC project. This can be done by using the match from other projects to offset the lack of match for DAC projects and maintain an acceptable match for the proposal as a whole.*
- Use existing resources – don't reinvent wheel. Some examples of existing public contact groups are planning groups, Farm Bureaus, Watershed groups, and Resource Conservation Districts.
- There is a good opportunity to interact with East County. There are planning groups there that are organized and would welcome participation in the IRWMP.

Conclusions/Actions

The team will incorporate mechanisms already in place as much as possible in the outreach process. Messages will be crafted that are appropriate for the target audience and are delivered by the right messengers. We will include elected officials and watershed groups in outreach efforts.

RAC Workgroup Overview, Purpose, Structure and Ground Rules

Ms. Watson provided an overview of the RAC Workgroup. The purpose of the Workgroup is to advise the RAC on which projects to include in the funding application package. The Workgroup will be composed of nine members including: one member representing the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA), one member representing the City of San Diego, one member representing the County of San Diego, one member representing retail water entities, two members representing natural resources and watersheds, one member representing water quality and two representatives from the members-at-large. The job of the Workgroup will be to narrow down the 50-60 Tier 1 projects to develop a proposed funding application package for the region. The

Workgroup will provide the subjective review necessary to account for factors that cannot be evaluated in the objective project scoring process.

Ms. Watson first reviewed the schedule and approach being followed for Plan Prioritization and Funding Application Screening. Projects were scored and prioritized into tiers in the Draft Plan. The project proponents are currently reviewing their scores and will provide comments by July 13. Based on those comments, the projects will be rescored and re-ranked and a revised set of Tier 1 projects will be established. At this point, three screening criteria will be applied to ensure that the projects can meet the minimum criteria to be considered in the Prop 50 funding application. These criteria are: the project proponent has requested consideration for Prop 50, CEQA/NEPA must be complete by December 2008 (if applicable), and watershed management or flood protection projects must have an implementation component. Ms. Watson provided a summary of key dates:

July 20: Deadline for nominations to the Workgroup

July 26: Draft Plan will be accepted by the SDCWA

August 1: RAC meeting - Project application funding shortlist and Workgroup announcement

August 14: RAC meeting - Approach to public comments on the Draft Plan

September 5: RAC meeting - Finalize project list for funding application

Ms. Watson stated that acceptance of the Draft Plan on July 26 by the SDCWA will help to increase the score of the Step 1 implementation grant application. The Step 2 application is projected to be due by January 1, 2008, which is the driver for having the RAC workgroup develop the application package by September 5. The City, County and SDCWA will all adopt the Plan in the November timeframe, once it has been finalized.

The Ground Rules are intended to guide an efficient process, since there will be a large number of projects (estimated at 50-60) that will need to be considered within four half-day meetings.

RAC Member Comments and Responses:
- Comments on Rules #2 and #3
  - August is one of the worst months for availability, can the Workgroup have alternates?
  - One alternate per category should be considered, as opposed to one for each primary representative.
- Comments on Rule # 7
  - The schedule for the Workgroup is very ambitious – September 5 [the presentation of the final funding application package to the RAC] is very soon. *We may have to adjust the schedule or the process but should consider the consequences of doing so. One of the reasons for the accelerated process is to allow sufficient time to prepare the Step 2 grant application which is expected to be due by the end of the year.*
- Comments on Rule #8
  - I object to the idea that the Workgroup meetings will be held behind closed doors, it should be an open process. We can restrict comments, but if you put it behind closed doors, then transparency is lost.
  - Consider the Workgroup as a technical group – there needs to be privacy to facilitate frank discussions where projects and criteria are examined. For instance, when the state reviews projects with a technical committee, the process is closed-door. The public

portion of the Workgroup process will occur at the RAC meeting where the results are presented. This RAC meeting will be a public forum where the outcome of the Workgroup can be vetted.

- The Workgroup will be making a decision, so the process should be open. *The Workgroup will be making a recommendation. The RAC will make the final decision.*
- If the meetings are open, then the public should be allowed to observe, but would be restricted from commenting.
- One compromise would be to open the first meeting to the public, so they can learn about the process.
- The burden should not be placed solely on the spokesperson to collect information. The other Workgroup members should be allowed to assist as well.

Comments on Rule #9

- Rule #9 should be eliminated. It is important to allow the Workgroup to communicate with external parties. The rule is also inconsistent with Rule #8 and Rule # 14.
- Allowing discussions outside the Workgroup may not be helpful. It can add a lot of noise and feedback from outside sources. We want to avoid situations where project proponents can have influence on the Workgroup decisions.
- The Workgroup is being asked to do a lot. They should be allowed to ask for information and clarification and have access to additional informational resources. *Rule #9 doesn't preclude that – the spokesperson can request clarifying information as questions arise during the Workgroup meetings. Additionally, topical experts will be available to act as resources during the meetings. The rationale for Rule #9 is we want the Workgroup to be empowered to make decisions and don't want the representatives to feel that they have their hands tied and must check in before making decisions. We also want to limit communications to the spokesperson so that a consistent message is being delivered.*
- If Rule# 9 is eliminated, then there should be a provision that if a Workgroup member does discuss Workgroup business outside the meetings, then they must provide disclosure to the other Workgroup members on these communications.
- In order to accomplish the work that required in the time allotted, the Workgroup will need to rely on a steady flow of information. The Workgroup will need to collect information in the interim. I don't see anything wrong with discussions outside the Workgroup.
- The Workgroup representatives should be able to initiate contact and ask for information, but proponents should not be allowed to make unsolicited contact.

Comments on Rule #11

- Rule #11 should read "If *at least* all present Workgroup members except one…"
- Rule #11 should be modified to require that a quorum should be present. A quorum would be defined as 50% plus 1 – in the case of the Workgroup, 5 out of 9 representatives. Alternates would be counted only if they are replacing a primary representative at the meeting.
- The 5 out of 9 requirement is only for determining if a meeting can be conducted. It does not change the votes required to add a project, correct? *Yes.*

Comments on Rule #13

- Will the information from the project applications be considered by the Workgroup? What is the logic behind not providing the project scores? *The project scores ensured that the Tier 1 projects were consistent with IRWM planning for the Region. However,*

there is a different set of criteria based on the requirements of the funding application, which the RAC will discuss.

- Is there an issue if the state sees disparities between the way that projects were ranked and prioritized in the Draft Plan versus the ultimate funding application package? *The projects in the Draft Plan were listed alphabetically within each Tier. In the Step 1 application, you don't need to identify what projects you are seeking funding for. We asked state what happens if Tier 1 changes and they confirmed that they acknowledge that the Plan is a Draft and modifications to the prioritized list are acceptable.*

Comments on Rule #14

- There are three options presented under Rule #14 for the Workgroup to consolidate or scale down projects. Can the Workgroup also recommend modifications to improve projects? For instance, making suggestions to add DAC and environmental justice related components?
- I am concerned about the Workgroup writing applications by suggesting modifications to projects – I am not sure if that is the desire. This should be discussed before the Workgroup is given that power.
- The proponent should have the opportunity to agree on modifications.
- What is the mechanism for communications with project proponents? *The spokesperson will contact the project proponents.*
- Will project proponents come to the meetings? *No.*

Comments on Rule #15

- How is agreement defined? *We defined it loosely – no strict definition.*
- Agreement should be defined and the vote required to constitute agreement should be determined today.
- The definition of agreement should require at least 7 votes and should not merely be quorum.
- A 2/3rd majority was proposed to constitute agreement. Alternate options to constitute agreement are to require a vote from at least one person from each category or to require one person from each category plus one.
- Should the definition of agreement apply to interim decisions or just the final application package decision? Are there any interim decisions to be made? *A possible interim decision point would be during the third meeting where projects will need to be nominated for consideration.*
- To avoid an overly complex process, the Workgroup should be allowed to determine how interim decisions are made.
- Will the RAC have any say about final package? Should a quorum or majority be required of RAC? *It will be important to recognize that the Workgroup will have seen a lot more information than RAC, so it should be entrusted to make appropriate recommendations once provided with guidance from the RAC. The RAC will retain the ability to make final comments. The hope is that if the right people are selected and appropriate guidance is provided then the Workgroup will develop a quality funding package.*
- The RAC should have some flexibility in deciding the final package.
- Is the Workgroup recommendation the final package? Should proponents be allowed to make presentation and make case for project?

- Linda Flournoy asked to go on record stating that she would like to register concern that with a 6 vote threshold for agreement (this was decided upon by the RAC – see below), there could be an imbalance, since there are five votes at the agency level [County of San Diego, City of San Diego, SDCWA, retail water agency representative and water quality representative]. There is the potential for watershed concerns to be left out.

Conclusions/Actions

The following decisions regarding modifications to the Workshop Ground Rules were made by vote of the RAC:

- Rule # 3: Each of the five areas will select one alternate representative. Alternates will attend all Workgroup meetings, but will only be asked to participate in the event that a regular member is absent.
- Rule # 8: Meetings of the Workgroup will remain limited to Workgroup members and public involvement will occur through the September 5th RAC meeting where the Workgroup will present the recommended funding application package.
- Rule #9: Rule #9 will be replaced by a rule or rules stating that communications with external parties must be initiated by Workgroup members, and members will report any external communications.
- Rule #14: The Workgroup will be allowed to recommend modifications for project improvements. The Workgroup spokesperson and other Workgroup representatives will be responsible for obtaining permission from proponents to make modifications to their projects, as necessary.
- Rule #15: Six votes will be required to make a decision on the funding application package. The Workgroup will decide the procedure on making interim decisions.
- Additional Rule: A rule will be added to state that a quorum will be required to conduct a Workgroup meeting. A quorum will be defined as more than half of the Workgroup members, or 5 out of 9.
- The Workshop Purpose, Structure and Ground Rules will be revised as soon as possible and distributed for review by the RAC.

RAC Workgroup – Suggested Criteria for Workgroup Consideration

Ms. Watson reviewed the proposed criteria for Workgroup consideration. The criteria are intended to guide the Workgroup in developing a proposed funding application package for Proposition 50 implementation grant funding that is acceptable to the RAC. The criteria are based on the scoring criteria to be used in evaluating Step 2 applications along with other criteria that have been deemed important to the Region. There are two levels of criteria. Criteria at the project level, such as budget, scientific and technical merit, grant administration cost-effectiveness, and schedule, will be applied to evaluate individual projects. Proposal-level criteria such as overall proposal schedule, workplan, funding match, economic analysis of water supply and water quality benefits, other expected benefits, program preferences, geographic parity, regional objectives, degree of benefit, degree of negative benefit, contribution to measureable targets, cost-effectiveness and amount leveraged will be use to evaluate the proposed funding package in its entirety.

RAC Member Comments and Responses:
- Can you clarify the $100K guideline for the cost-effectiveness of grant administration criteria – is it asking for the inclusion or exclusion of smaller projects? *It is*

> *recommending that where possible, smaller projects should be bundled into larger projects to help minimize the impact of grant administration costs on overall cost-effectiveness. For instance, in some cases, there will be significant monitoring costs that can last for years which may not be cost-effective for smaller grants.*

- We should avoid specifying specific numbers in the criteria and should offer general guidelines. *The criteria were developed with as much specificity as possible, to reflect specific guidelines in the Proposition 50 Proposal Solicitation Package. However, in the case of cost-effectiveness of grant administration, the $100K number was proposed based on experience and judgment.*

- When the Workgroup discusses projects, will they use project or proposal criteria? *Project-level criteria will be used to evaluate projects on an individual basis. The proposal-level criteria will evaluate the funding application package as a whole.*

- What is the role of the economist? *The economist will convert project benefits into dollars.*

- What does economic analysis have to do with water quality benefits? Don't we also care about the economic analysis of habitat? *There will be quantifiable benefits measured in terms of water quality metrics and the economic analysis will convert this to a dollar value. The economic analysis of habitat is covered in "Other Expected Benefits".*

- Is the economic analysis of water supply and water quality benefits criteria based on the Proposition 50 requirements? *Yes.*

- Does Proposition 50 allow DAC-related projects to be included with no match? *There is no funding match required at the project level. There is a 10% minimum match required for the proposal as a whole, unless a region applies for a DAC waiver. This allows discretion to accept projects that have little or no funding match as long as the overall proposal achieves a minimum funding match of 10%.*

- A requirement should be added that requires a 10% match for a project to be considered in the funding application. The Workgroup could provide a waiver of this requirement for projects that benefit DACs.

- Should the Workgroup be allowed to consider other types of projects for waivers?

- Waivers for other non-DAC projects should be left to the discretion of the RAC.

- The 10% requirement was not specified in the application, so some project proponents may have an issue with being eliminated because of this requirement.

- Please record in the minutes that the 10% minimum requirement was considered and there was consensus that it was a good idea, however, it could not be instituted at this point because project proponents would not have been aware of this requirement. We would like to consider adding this requirement in future funding rounds. (This statement made after the RAC decided **not** to add a requirement for projects to demonstrate a 10% match.)

- Project proponents should be required to demonstrate that they have approval of all the necessary parties to implement projects and can meet the criteria. *Once the initial proposed funding package has been developed, we will check with project proponents to confirm that the selected projects can meet requirements.*

- The standard State contracts for Proposition 50 implementation grants are available. The project proponents could be required to review the contracts and sign off. *We will circulate the contracting requirements and request confirmation from proponents that their organizations can agree to the terms.*

- How do we know if a project benefits DACs? *That information was requested in the project applications.*

Conclusions/Actions

The following decisions regarding modifications to the Suggested Criteria for Workgroup Consideration were made by vote of the RAC:

- Project-Level Criteria:
  -Cost-effectiveness of grant administration: Delete the reference to $100K.
- Proposal-Level Criteria:
  -Funding Match: Verify with proponents of projects selected for inclusion in the proposed funding package that they possess the matching funds stated in their application.
  -Funding Match: A criterion that requires project proponents to have a 10% minimum funding match (with exceptions possible for DAC projects) should not be added at the current time.
- Other Decisions:
  -Project proponents should be asked to review the State contracting requirements for Proposition 50 and acknowledge that they have the ability to meet the terms of the contract, which includes the submission of extensive financial information.
- The Suggested Criteria for Workgroup Consideration will be revised as soon as possible and distributed for review by the RAC.

RAC Workgroup – Workgroup Meeting Topics and Objectives

Ms. Watson presented the proposed topics and objectives for the four meetings that are envisioned for the Workgroup. Prior the first meeting, the Workgroup members will review project abstracts. During Meeting 1, the Workgroup will review the workshop purpose, structure, and ground rules; choose a spokesperson; review project abstracts; and discuss projects. The objective of the meeting will be to gain a shared understanding of individual projects. During Meeting 2, the Workgroup will review projects using the project-level criteria. The objective is to gain understanding of the merits of individual projects as they relate to the project-level criteria. Meeting 3 will involve nominating and discussing projects for inclusion in the funding package. The objective of this meeting is to develop a list of projects to include in the funding package. In Meeting 4, the Workgroup will be asked to develop a $25M funding application proposal and evaluate the proposal with proposal-level criteria and revise as necessary. The objective of this final meeting is to refine the list of nominated projects and develop a $25M funding package to be presented to the RAC on September 5th. The actual dates of the meetings are not known and will be decided once the composition of the Workgroup has been finalized.

RAC Member Comments and Responses:

- When will approval of the funding application package by the RAC be required? *This should occur at either the September 5th meeting, but could be postponed to the September 19th RAC meeting, at the latest.*
- The proposed schedule is a good first step. However, by the fourth meeting, the Work Group will need to get more information, contact project proponents and may not be in position to make decision on the package. *We could begin that process at the third meeting instead.*

- An observation: if you spend the first meeting discussing all of the projects, you will need to spend about 3 minutes per project.

Conclusions/Actions

There should be some flexibility given to the Workgroup in meeting times, topics, and schedule.

The five areas will continue to caucus after today's meeting to select the nominee and alternate for their respective area. Nominations are due on July 28th.

Step 1 Application

Ms. Toby Roy discussed the upcoming SDCWA Board action to accept the Draft San Diego IRWM Plan (Plan). In the RAC Memorandum of Understanding, it was agreed that any motion to the Board would be first taken to the RAC. The Board will be asked to adopt a resolution accepting the plan. This is being undertaken as a formality to allow the Step 1 application to gain an additional 4 points. This does not prevent us from updating the Plan. Today, we will need to have the endorsement of the RAC to take the motion to the Board.

RAC Member Comments and Responses:
- Can we receive a copy of the resolution? *Yes, a copy of the resolution will be provided, along with the date of the Board meeting.*
- Can you clarify that the resolution will allow the Plan to be submitted and accepted as a Draft? *Yes, the resolution is to accept the Draft San Diego IRWM Plan.*
- There was an issue with watershed management plans that were accepted (as opposed to adopted). The State did not consider these plans until they were adopted. *We checked with the State on this issue. The Proposition 50 language currently defines adoption as "formal acceptance". This will likely change for Prop 84.*
- I believe it hurts the Plan to remove a discussion of sustainability. We should add sustainability back into the Plan.
- I want express appreciation to Ms. Roy for going to the Board. *You are welcome to attend the Board meeting on Thursday, July 26th to show support and be recognized for your contributions. We will send an email reminder of the meeting.*
- The status of the IRWM Plan is being taking as an information item to the San Diego City Council a week from Wednesday. The Highlights Document will be distributed.

Conclusions/Actions

The RAC moved to endorse the SDCWA Board action to adopt a resolution accepting the Draft San Diego Integrated Regional Water Management Plan. The motion carried unanimously.

A copy of the SDCWA board resolution will be provided, along with the date of the Board meeting.

Updates

Mr. Jeff Pasek gave an update on the upcoming Proposition 50 Step 1 Implementation Grant Workshops being hosted by DWR on July 10th in Sacramento and July 12th in Riverside. The

RWMG and the consultant team have formulated questions in advance of the meetings and will be sending representatives to attend both workshops. Mr. Pasek also reviewed the San Diego IRWM Plan Highlights document, which was designed to be an eye-catching visual summary of the Plan. No deadline has been set for updating the Highlights Document. Please feel free to offer suggestions. Photos and graphics would be especially appreciated.

Ms. Cathy Pieroni provided an update on the California Water Plan 2009. There is a meeting for the South Coast District on July 25th at MWD from 8:30 am to noon. The Water Plan 2009 handout shows all upcoming Water Plan 2009 meetings. Ms. Pieroni also reviewed information on the first global climate change summit in the region to be held on July 12th at San Diego State University. The summit is being held to initiate a regional dialogue to allow the region to address the requirements of the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32).

Conclusions/Actions

Information on upcoming California Water Plan 2009 meetings will be emailed to the RAC.

Updates

The next RAC meeting will be held on August 1 from 9:00-11:30 am.

Public Comments

- There has been a lot of discussion focused on the quorum requirement. The RAC should be able to justify how you determined the definition of a quorum. I would recommend that the standard definition of quorum be used, which is greater than 50%. *The definition that will be used for quorum will be greater than 50% of the Workshop members (5 of 9 members).*
- If any RAC committee speaks with a member of the Work Group, will there be documentation? *Yes, Minutes of the Workgroup meetings will be taken and made public.*