



Project Clean Water

Watershed Protection Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Summary

March 3, 2005, 2:00 PM – 4:00 PM
San Diego County Water Authority
4677 Overland Avenue, San Diego, CA 92123

Stakeholders Participating:

Melanie Craig – Weston Solutions	Dick Bobertz – San Dieguito River Park
Trish Boaz - County of San Diego	Cathy Cibit – City of San Diego
Rob Hutsel – San Diego River Park Foundation	Eileen Goff – Geomorph Information Systems
Bob Collins – City of San Diego	Paul Gebert - County Water Authority
Vicki Driver - County Water Authority	Jim Hogan - MACTEC
Jeff Pasek – City of San Diego	Elizabeth Giffen - County of San Diego
Michele White – Port of San Diego	Peggy Goldstein - County of San Diego
Deborah Jayne – SDRWQCB	Jon VanRhyn - County of San Diego
Kelly Barker - County of San Diego	Christian Braun - County of San Diego
David Younkman	Jerry Rolwry – Borrego Water District
Nancy Winiarz – Port of San Diego	Matt Rahn – San Diego State University
Chris Basilevac – The Nature Conservancy	Judy Mitchell – Mission Resource Conservation District
Shelby Tucker - SANDAG	Suzanne Michel – WRP
Kelly Hendrickson - Zoological Society of San Diego	Andrew Zingale – Office of Assembly Member Lori Saldaña
Marcelo Reginato – CHZM	Eileen Goff – Geomorph Solutions, Inc.
Miles Pomeroy – City of San Diego	Chiara Clemente - SDRWQCB
Richard Wright – San Diego State University	Jason Giessow – Santa Margarita San Luis Rey Weed Management Area
Sheri McPherson – County of San Diego	Lucy Frank – County of San Diego
Robin Rierdan – San Diego River Park Foundation	Joseph Arlotto – Zoological Society of San Diego
Meleah Ashford – City of Encinitas	Katherine Comer – Institute for Regional Studies of the Californias
Suzanne Lawrence - Scripps Institution of Oceanography–	Vicki Driver – County Water Authority

Introductions

Bob Collins and Rob Hutsel, co-chairs of the Watershed Protection TAC opened the meeting and provided an introduction to the TAC and the purpose of this meeting. Vickie Driver with the San Diego County Water Authority (CWA) took a minute for introductions. Participants

introduced themselves and stated their organization. Vickie handed out her card at the meeting. She can be contacted at:

Phone - (858) 522-6760
Fax - (858) 268-7881
e-mail - vdriver@sdcwa.org

I. Status Update

- **Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan Outline Development**

Vicki Driver provided an update on the development of the IRWM Plan. Currently, the plan is in the outline stage. The CWA is in the process of contracting a consultant to develop the plan outline. Hopefully, the IRWM Plan development team will be able to use the same consultant that develops the outline for the development of the final IRWM Plan.

A substantial draft of the IRWM Plan must be completed by the Grant due date, sometime in September according to the current Prop. 50 schedule. Vicki noted that Dana Frieauf with the CWA has a draft copy of the outline. Contact Vicki at the e-mail address listed above for information regarding this outline.

- **Request for Proposals for Consultant to Prepare Outline for IRWM Plan**

RFPs are due to Vicki Driver (see above contact info) by close of business on Friday, March 11, 2005. This RFP process will move quickly, with consultants being interviewed on March 18 and a final decision made by March 21, 2005.

Comments/Questions

- **Q:** Trish Boaz with the County of San Diego asked whether the lack of adopted Watershed Management Plans (WMPs) would have an adverse effect on the application process, and if their adoption would strengthen the proposals
- **A:** Vicki Driver noted that substantial progress has been made toward Watershed Management Plan development and this progress will count toward our goal, according to requirements specified in the Project Solicitation Package (PSP) for Prop. 50 funding. Vicki will ask Dana Frieauf for a more specific answer to this question.

Bob Collins commented that the IRWM Plan development is going to proceed even if there are no **adopted** WMPs. Many plans are final or in the finishing stages, but not adopted. A report on the status of the WMPs will be provided at the time that the IRWM Plan is completed.

A few thoughts from Chiara Clemente with the SDRWQCB:

- Chiara noted that the WMPs should **not** be incorporated by reference into the IRWM Plan, as the IRWM Plan needs to be a stand-alone document, but rather the parts of the various WMPs should be incorporated directly as needed. Dave Gibson further cautioned that this might not be the case for future funding

- opportunities, so it wouldn't hurt to seek adoption of the WMPs wherever possible.
- Chiara also wanted to remind everyone that the 10% match has to be with non-state funds.
 - 'Contract ready' proposals will be given preference over those that are not 'contract ready,' but proposals that are not 'contract ready' should not be discouraged from applying.
 - The next funding cycle for Prop. 50 will be as early as Summer 2006, but that remains a moving target. Nevertheless, it never hurts to be ready for the earliest-case scenario.
 - Although, in the past, projects (and their contracts) have been limited to 3-year terms, SWRCB is looking at changing that. In the interim, if a project proponent has a project that they think will take longer than 3 years, they should still be encouraged to submit the project with an accurate timeline. Worse case scenario, when the project undergoes SWRCB review, they may be asked to compress their schedule.
 - The SWRCB is pretty clear on the definition of a disadvantaged community. What is not as clear is whether a proposal that will cover more projects in disadvantaged communities will be given preference over one with less, or whether it will just be given a match break. We will do some more homework on this one and report back at the next meeting.

II. Implementation of Project Proposals

- **Review of Schedule for Submittal/Review**

Bob Collins reviewed the schedule for project submittal and review. Proposals are to be submitted electronically to:

Sheri McPherson

County of San Diego Department of Public Works, Watershed Protection

e-mail: Sheri.mcpherson@sdcounty.ca.gov

phone: (858) 495-5285

Proposals are due to Sheri by **5:00 PM on Friday, March 25, 2005**.

During April, a technical committee composed of the three IRWM Plan cooperating agencies, academia, non-profits groups, and (hopefully) the SDRWQCB will review and rank these proposals for consistency with the IRWM Plan outline (in development). By early to mid May, the selected projects will be asked to make changes to their proposal for consistency with other selected projects and consistency with IRWM Plan goals. These changes could include decreasing scope of project or decreasing requested funding.

The technical review committee will have to go by the IRWM Plan outline to determine consistency with the IRWM Plan, and the IRWM Plan will not be anywhere near completion. Finally, the application, the memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the three cooperating agencies, the IRWM Plan outline, and the list of proposals and their descriptions will be sent electronically to Sacramento in late May, 2005.

Comments/Questions

- Suzanne Michel with the Wetlands Recovery Project (WRP) complimented the participating agencies on their handling of the Prop. 50 application process. Suzanne voiced concern over the ability of small, non-profits to be able to complete the required application by March 25. Suzanne offered help to these non-profits in the form of templates from the WRP. She suggested groups having trouble contact her for assistance (smichel@scwrp.org, (619) 334-3072).
- Meleah Ashford with the City of Encinitas clarified the steps of the Prop. 50 application process into four phases;
 - 1) 2 page proposal back in December 2004
 - 2) Project application form due to Sheri McPherson by March 25.
 - 3) Screening of the submitted applications by the technical committee.
 - 4) Refine proposals selected by the technical committee for submittal to the State Water Resources Control Board by end of May 2005.
- Trish Boaz inquired about the status of the MOU. Jon Van Rhyn replied that it is now in legal review by the participating agencies.

• Review of Project Application Form

Jon Van Rhyn went over the project application form sent out in e-mail to the Watershed Protection TAC on Thursday, February 24. Please contact Sheri McPherson if you need an application form. The following points were made with regard to the Project Application Form:

- 1) Describe the project and how it relates to the IRWM Plan Regional Objectives (#1 on page 2). There are five regional objectives and the project should be tied to one or more of these objectives.
- 2) Be consistent with the State of California Program Preferences (#2 on page 2). There are six Program Preferences and the project should be tied to at least one of these. Be sure to explain clearly how the project is tied to the Preference(s).
- 3) Tie the project to one or more of the Water Management Strategies (#3 starting on page 2). There are twenty Water Management Strategies and although multiple strategies do not have to be addressed, it behooves project writers to address as many as can be justified.
- 4) Address Statewide Priorities (# 4 on Page 3). Again, it behooves project writers to address as many Priorities as can be justified.
- 5) Address additional preferences/ranking criteria (B at the top of Page 4). Weight will be given to projects that have a team approach, projects that are ready for implementation or have a detailed plan on how to get there, and projects that demonstrate measurable water quality benefits. Land acquisition projects must be able to demonstrate water quality and/or water quantity benefits.
- 6) A system of rating the proposals is being developed and will be available at http://www.projectcleanwater.org/html/prop_50.html.
- 7) Section II of the application packet is self-explanatory. The project control number is the number issued to the various projects when the County received them. This number can also be found at http://www.projectcleanwater.org/html/prop_50.html.
- 8) Section H, Legislative Information, should be filled out for the entire project area.

- 9) Section I, Need for Project, is the opportunity to sell project to the technical review committee. There are no space limitations on this section, but remember that there were 82 pre-proposals received and if half of these submit final proposals, the committee will have a great deal of work ahead of it.
- 10) Exhibit A, Page 11 is left up to the group submitting the proposal application as to who needs to sign it. The technical committee will be flexible with the submittal of Exhibit A, as long as the project team has a plan for getting the document signed.
- 11) Attachment 6 is a detailed project description. It behooves the project team to describe how the project fits into the EPA's nine elements of a watershed plan.
- 12) Attachment 7, the Cost Estimate, must pass a reality check and should not be over-inflated. Project planners should talk with colleagues in order to obtain realistic cost estimates.
- 13) Attachment 8, the Schedule, should provide start and end dates for each sub-task. The schedule should also closely match the cost. If it is possible to provide a gaunt chart, that would be helpful to the technical review committee.
- 14) Attachment 13, Environmental Compliance, needs to be determined on a project-by-project basis. The environmental compliance requirements should also be shown on the schedule, attachment 8.

There was some discussion on how to determine if a particular project falls under the disadvantaged community heading. Robin Rierdan suggested that project planners research slum and blight areas by contacting your respective community planning districts.

III. Review of Proposals / Suggestions for Change or Collaboration

There have been some successes in collaboration on the basis of geographic area (watersheds and regions).

IV. Updates / Reports From Watershed Groups

Tijuana River Watershed – Dr. Richard Wright and Katherine Comer

The Binational Watershed Advisory Council has received funding so that it may keep meeting through May of 2006. A final version of the Binational Vision for the Tijuana River Watershed will be available in mid-summer. The Tijuana River Watershed Atlas, a comprehensive set of geographical data about the Tijuana River Watershed, has been published. A binational ecology workgroup is spinning off of the EPA Border 2012 Water Task Force.

The Ramsar Convention of Wetlands has declared the Tijuana River Estuary a Wetland of International Importance.

Otay Watershed – Trish Boaz

The Otay Watershed Management Plan consultant is in process of developing a GIS web tool.

Chollas Creek Watershed – Suzanne Michel

The Chollas Watershed received a nationwide groundwork grant for the creation of commitment-based groups for the purpose of Brownfield Restoration.

San Diego River Watershed – Liz Giffen

The last meeting of the San Diego River Watershed Workgroup (with Prop 13 funding) is March 11 at the City of Santee. The workgroup will be celebrating its accomplishments over the last three years. See http://www.projectcleanwater.org/html/ws_san_diego_river_plan.html for more details.

Penasquitos Watershed – Cathy Cibit

The Los Peñasquitos Watershed Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) and Project Team are finalizing the Watershed Management Plan.

Rose Creek Watershed – Suzanne Michel

The Rose Creek Watershed Alliance is looking for partners to assist in the removal of concrete channels.

San Dieguito River Watershed – Cathy Cibit

Watershed Management Plan Development team is moving forward by develop a TAC.

Carlsbad Watershed – Meleah Ashford

The Carlsbad Watershed is in the process of implementing a Basins Grant, and they are participating in the implementation of the IPM Grant.

Santa Margarita River Watershed – Liz Giffen

The Final Watershed Management Plan is complete. As the Prop 13 funding ends in March, the next phase of the project is to form a Watershed Council led by Camp Pendleton, County of San Diego, San Diego State University and City of Temecula.

Borrego Watershed – Jerry Rolwry

The Anza-Borrego Desert State Park has increased its desert wilderness area.

Scripps Institution of Oceanography – Suzanne Lawrence

Working toward a permit for discharge to receiving waters.

Next Meeting – The next meeting will be held mid-May. One topic includes how the priority list of projects was developed