

MEMO

Date: November 10, 2010  
 To: Water Quality Working Group  
 From: Michael Drennan, Weston Solutions

Subject: Meeting Notes - WQWG Meeting of November 9, 2010

Following is a brief summary of comments received at the meeting. I have organized the comments by the PowerPoint slides presented at the meeting. Please review and comment.

Slide	Topic	Comments Received
1	Agenda	None
2	Needs Assessment Report Revisions	<p>It was suggested that the new 4-page staff report that is needed for SANDAG’s agenda in December could also serve as the new expanded Executive Summary. The Group agreed that the existing Exec Sum should be revised to accomplish this objective.</p> <p>Another suggestion was to develop an Executive Summary in the form of “Frequently Asked Questions”. The Group agreed that a separate stand-alone document organized in this fashion would be preferable.</p> <p>The Group also requested that the report include a paragraph which acknowledges the importance of considering a variety of factors when distributing funding from a regional SANDAG funding measure. At a minimum, these factors should include: land use, population, impermeable areas, development, water quality need, risk of failure, consequence of failure, political. This paragraph should immediately follow the sentence in the report which indicates we have developed a hypothetical distribution of the \$10B equally among 11 watersheds, simply for the purposes of illustrating one possible scenario of programs and projects that might be possible in one watershed (the San Diego River Watershed).</p>
3	Timeline	<p>Nov. 17 - Revised sections of Needs Assessment Report Due to WQWG          Nov. 22 - WQWG to provide comments on Needs Assessment          Nov 22 - 4-Page draft SANDAG Summary report and ES due to WQWG          Nov 29 - WQWG to provide comments on draft SANDAG Summary report and ES.          Nov 29 - Next WQWG Meeting          Nov 29 – Draft SWG PowerPoint due to WQWG          Dec 3 – Final Needs Assessment due to SANDAG          Dec 3 – Final SANDAG Summary report due to SANDAG          Dec 15 – Present PowerPoint to SANDAG SWG Meeting</p>
4	Summary Report and Presentation to SWG	<p><b>Bill Harris</b> provided some eloquent language about the evolution of modern civilization on the natural landscape, and the impact of industrialization and urbanization on water quality and our overall quality of life. He suggested that the SWG presentation should begin with this overview. The Group agreed that this summary should include a brief history of the Clean Water Act, including the evolution of nonpoint sources being regulated with the 1987 amendments to the CWA, and the regulation of stormwater runoff. The Group also thought it was important to strongly emphasize the connection between water quality and the</p>

		economic health of our region, and the fact the need for a funding measure is imperative to prevent our quality of life from eroding as increased urbanization occurs in the future.
5	Basis of Presentation to SWG	<p>Use the bar chart rather than the 5 coins to help tell the story of how the \$5B from SANDAG will be leveraged.</p> <p>Consider depicting the “Do Nothing” option as a negative portion of the bar chart. Consider presenting qualitative examples of the impacts of the “Do Nothing” option including the economic impacts of public health impacts due to poor stormwater quality (see Beach Epidemiological Study by Heal the Bay), or economic impacts of beach closures.</p> <p>Get input from SANDAG about the economic benefits of tourism in our Region. <b>Bill Harris</b> committed to asking the Building Industry Association (BIA) for information they may have on the development community’s existing expenditures on water quality, and/or the costs of compliance for new development. This amount could be included as an additional amount in item 1.A. of the existing expenditures.</p> <p>Contact Patty Krebs with the San Diego Industrial Environmental Association for additional information about industry’s existing expenditures/costs of compliance.</p>
6	Leveraging Funding	<p>The Group supported the idea of providing examples to the SWG of how some local projects have leveraged other funding from local, state and federal partners. The Group also recommended that another method of demonstrating the validity of the concept of leveraging is to summarize the available funding from other sources including the following (amounts in parenthesis were annual estimates suggested during the discussion):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EPA 319h Grant Program</li> <li>• Proposition 84 and future California Water Bonds (\$10-20M)</li> <li>• Regional Board Cleanup and Abatement account</li> <li>• Federal Farm Bill including Agricultural Water Enhancement Program (\$1M), and Environmental Quality Incentive Program (\$700K) through the Natural Resources Conservation Service and US Department of Agriculture)</li> <li>• State Transportation Project Mitigation Funding</li> </ul> <p>Any information on the funds that might be available for water quality through these programs will be appreciated.</p>
7	Regional Efficiencies	<p>The Group agreed that programs such as Outreach/Education and Monitoring are good examples of where significant savings might occur by developing regional programs rather than funding 22 separate co-permittee programs. There was no consensus on the potential savings, but one estimate was that at least 50% of existing expenditures could be saved.</p> <p><b>Michael Drennan</b> pointed out the IRWMP study in Los Angeles included a benefit cost analysis of three alternatives and concluded that regional solutions provided the best return on investment. He committed to providing a paragraph in the report which summarized this conclusion.</p>
8	Regulatory Changes	<p>The Group agreed that it was important to share with the SWG the potential for future regulatory changes which might reduce the current estimate of funding needed in the Needs Assessment. They cited activities they defined as “True Source Control” such as the Brake Pad Partnership, Styrofoam bans, and pesticide regulations as examples.</p>

9	Existing Expenditures	Due to time constraints, "existing expenditures" was skipped and the group moved on to the next section.
10	The Cost of "No Action"	The Group recommended that this section emphasize the intrinsic value of habitat and water quality, as well as the economic benefits of tourism and public health. They recommended that the San Diego Regional Economic Development Corporation would have data to support this discussion.