



Workgroup

Meeting #1 Notes

August 14, 2007, 1:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

San Diego County Water Authority

4677 Overland Avenue, San Diego, CA 92123

Attendance – Primary

Kirk Ammerman, City of Chula Vista (Water Quality)
Robyn Badger, San Diego Zoological Society (Acting At-Large)
Dennis Bostad, Sweetwater Authority (Water Retailers)
Greg Krzys, United States Bureau of Reclamation (Acting Natural Resources and Watersheds)
Kathleen 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)
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

Neal Brown, Padres Dam Municipal Water District (Water Quality)
Jeff Pasek, City of San Diego (City of San Diego)
Brett Kawakami, RMC Water and Environment
Alyson Watson, RMC Water and Environment

Introductions

Ms. Alyson Watson (RMC Water and Environment) welcomed Workgroup members to their first meeting. Brief introductions were made. Nine voting members were present, representing a quorum. Two alternates were also present. A conference line was set up to accommodate the participation of Megan Johnson (Natural Resources and Watersheds); however, because she did not call in, Greg Krzys acted as a representative for Natural Resources and Watersheds in her absence.

Organizational Items

Ms. Watson (RMC Water and Environment) reviewed a number of organizational items as covered in the handouts provided:

1. Workshop Purpose, Structure, and Ground Rules
2. Suggested Criteria for Workgroup Consideration
3. Anticipated Workgroup Meeting Topics
4. Prop 50 Scoring Considerations

Ground Rules

Discussion: The Workgroup discussed the ground rule pertaining to discussion on specific projects for which Workgroup representatives are proponents or beneficiaries, as well as whether only primary representatives should participate in discussions.

Conclusions / Actions

- Workgroup members who are project proponents or beneficiaries should refrain from discussing their projects.
- Workgroup members who are project proponents or beneficiaries can pass a note to the spokesperson if they wish to provide clarifying information on the project. The spokesperson will decide whether to report the information to the group.
- Ground Rule #14 should be modified to replace “beneficiary with “direct beneficiary (i.e., financial beneficiary)”.
- The meeting notes should reflect decisions and general discussion items.
- As the Workgroup process continues to evolve, the Workgroup should have the ability to revisit the ground rules and suggest modifications to the RAC to improve the process.

Criteria

Discussion: The Workgroup discussed the criteria established by the RAC.

Conclusions / Actions

- As the Workgroup gets closer to developing a package, project proponents should be asked to verify information (e.g., ability to provide cost match). The Workgroup does not want to be placed in a position of recommending projects when they are not truly ready to meet the criteria.
- Follow-up questions on projects should come from designated Workgroup members to avoid repetition and to present a unified front. Contact must be reported at the next Workgroup meeting.

Schedule

Discussion: The Workgroup revisited the schedule for meetings.

Conclusions / Actions

- Future meetings will be held 8/23 from 8 AM to 12 PM at the Sweetwater Authority (details forthcoming); 8/29 from 8 AM to 5 PM (location to be determined); and 9/7 from 8 AM to 12 PM (location to be determined).
- Call-in phone numbers will be provided for all meetings.

Designation of Foreperson

Discussion: Nominations for foreperson were solicited.

Conclusions / Actions

- Kirk Ammerman was selected as the Workgroup spokesperson

Project Review

Discussion: Different strategies for selecting the overall package were discussed, such as crafting a package to include 3-4 larger projects (in terms of grants requested) along with smaller projects for the remaining funds as opposed to selecting a large number of smaller projects to provide more variety. The Workgroup also discussed the initial approach in how to review and discuss the projects.

Conclusions / Actions

- The initial approach to project selection will include briefly reviewing projects to preliminarily categorize them as A, B, or C. A indicates a general consensus that the project should be considered for funding through this program, B indicates that the project may be considered for funding through this program, and C indicates that the project may not be right for this funding program.

Project Discussion and Preliminary Categorization

In order to initiate project discussions and organize projects further, the Workgroup decided to review and discuss the project list and assign each project to a preliminary category A, B or C as described above.

Project #1: Acquisition of Willow Glen Farm.

Discussion: The Workgroup felt that the project was small (4 acres), and relatively expensive project on private property and had a focus on agriculture. The following questions were raised regarding the project:

- Has fund-raising for the project been initiated?
- Can the parcel numbers be provided ?
- Is the project in a critical habitat area?

Conclusions / Actions

The project was preliminarily placed into category C.

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

Discussion: The Workgroup asked for clarification on the claimed 250,000 gpd of potable water use reduction. Responses to questions will be requested from the project proponent by Robyn Badger. The following questions were raised regarding the project:

- How was the 250,000 gpd of potable use water reduction benefit determined?
- Is the 250,000 gpd a peak or an average?
- Does the 250,000 refer to the gallons that the system can store?

Conclusions / Actions

The project was not categorized pending additional information.

Project #3: Carlsbad Desalination Project Local Conveyance

Discussion: Responses to the following questions were provided by Mr. Bob Yamada.

- Is the project only asking for funds for the distribution system (as opposed to the power plant itself)? *Yes.*
- How does this project fit into SDCWA plans? *The supply that would be provided by this project is included in the SDCWA 2005 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) as a verifiable supply.*
- Why isn't SDCWA listed as a partner? *It is considered a local resource project. SDCWA supports the project, but does not partner as it is being implemented locally.*

Conclusions / Actions

The project was preliminarily placed into category A/B.

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

Discussion: The Workgroup found it to be a well-written proposal.

Conclusions / Actions

The project was preliminarily placed into category A/B.

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

Discussion: The question was raised as to why region should initiate demonstration projects if the technology is already known to be effective. Responses to the following questions will be requested from the project proponent.

- Will the project examine whether putting water into the ground is a good idea from an infrastructure standpoint?
- Can this project be linked to TMDL issues in the Chollas Creek Watershed?

Conclusions / Actions

The project was not categorized pending further discussion.

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

Discussion: There was discussion about whether the low amount of rainfall in the San Diego region would make the project worthwhile, though it is the lack of rainfall that makes it important to capture rainfall when it is available. The Workgroup questioned whether this project could be captured in other projects (e.g. similar to stormwater capture) and raised the possibility that it could be bundled.

Conclusions / Actions

The project was not categorized pending further discussion.

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

Discussion: Some reservation was expressed about the cost of the project. Responses to the following questions were provided by Mr. Jeff Pasek.

- What parks will be served? *Parks in North City. This will not expand the currently planned usage of recycled water.*

Conclusions / Actions

The project was not categorized pending additional information.

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

Discussion: There was some concern expressed about the operational nature of the project. Responses to questions were provided by Mr. Jeff Pasek.

- Is this project for operations? *It would buy a streetsweeper and pay for an operator for 2 years.*
- Which pollutants of concern would be addressed? *Copper, lead and zinc.*
- Can San Diego maintain the project for longer than 2 years? *There is a Phase 2 project proposed for subsequent years.*

Conclusions / Actions

The project was preliminarily placed into category C.

Project #9: Conservation in the Campo Valley

Discussion: Responses to the following question will be requested from the project proponent.

- *Where are the exact locations of the land acquisitions?*

Conclusions / Actions

The project was not categorized pending additional information.

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

Discussion: The Workgroup noted that this project had similarities with Projects #4 and #5. Responses to the following questions will be requested from the project proponent.

- How likely is it that the project will benefit the groundwater basin?
- Which pollutants of concern would actually be addressed?
- Can this project be bundled with Projects #4 and #5.

Conclusions / Actions

The project was preliminarily placed into category B.

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

Discussion: The project was considered to be a good project that could provide benefits to the region.

Conclusions / Actions

The project was preliminarily placed into category A/B.

Project #12: Educational Demonstration Wetland Project

Discussion: A question was raised about how the project will actually measure the education achieved. Responses to the following questions will be requested from the project proponent.

- How do you measure Education?
- How will the project accomplish the goal of changing behavior?

Conclusions / Actions

The project was not categorized pending additional information.

Action Items for Next Meeting

RMC will categorize and sort projects by type. RMC will also ensure that version dates are included on all materials and that projects are numbered.

The Workgroup representatives will follow up on questions for project proponents. Additionally, the Workgroup will determine if there are any Tier 2 projects that they would like to nominate for consideration in the project selection process.