

**Watershed Stewardship Initiative Group (WPGG) Minutes**  
**February 2, 2006**  
**Metropolitan Biosolids Center**

In attendance: Craig Adams (San Dieguito River Valley Conservancy), Joseph Arlotto (Zoological Society of San Diego), Lynne Baker (Endangered Habitats League), Kelly Barker (County of San Diego MSCP Div.), Lilian Busse (Scripps Institute of Oceanography), Steve Butkus (Weston Solutions), Bob Collins (Private Citizen), Arlene Dea Deeley (City of San Diego Water), Bruce Ferguson (Weston Solutions), Peggy Goldstein (County of San Diego), Mike Gonzales (City of San Diego Water), Tedi Jackson (City of San Diego), Lisa Kay (Weston Solutions), Dave Meyer (Rancho Bernardo Planning Board), Jeff Pasek (City of San Diego Water), Bruce Posthumus (Regional Water Quality Board), Phil Pryde (River Park JPA), Freda Reid (San Dieguito Lagoon Committee), Bill Simmons (San Dieguito River Valley Conservancy), Grace Terrazas (Cleveland National Forest), Mark Whitehead (WPGG Chairman), Jacqueline Winterer (Friends of San Dieguito River Park), Garret Williams (Weston Solutions), Matt Witman (San Pasqual Valley Planning), Richard Wright (San Diego State University)

Meeting was called to order at 1:34 p.m. by Chairman Mark Whitehead.

**A) Introductions**

This meeting will introduce the draft of the watershed management plan, decide how and when to provide feedback, etc. The feedback will be incorporated into the final draft which will go out to the public and various public agencies for comment. All comments will then be incorporated into the final plan.

Since it has been a while since there was a regular meeting everyone introduced themselves.

**B) Announcements**

There were no December minutes to approve.

Jeff Pasek announced that Bob Collins retired at the end of last year and Cathy Cibit is now working for the County of San Diego, so he is taking over the roles that Bob and Cathy had until this project is complete.

Jeff announced that the Otay River Watershed Plan is about 4-5 months ahead of us with their plan; they just came out with their final draft. Also, the San Diego River Watershed Plan was completed about a year ago. Jeff has copies of both plans on CD if anyone wants to see them.

Tedi announced that they were going back before CalTrans on February 23<sup>rd</sup> in Sacramento. The proposed signage will be an action item to approve a pilot study within San Diego County. There will be three different sizes of the signs, one for rural highways, one for urban highways, and one for small roads. For the six signs that we want the cost will be approximately \$25,000. Four signs for the San Diego River would be posted on Highways 67 and 8. Two signs for San Dieguito would be posted on Highway 15. The pilot study will last one year in which time we need to show results. The rest of the state would then be able to use the same type of signs which should be very useful.

### **C) First Draft of San Dieguito Watershed Management Plan**

Weston explained how it took a whole team to develop the draft plan which has about 400 pages. They gave a Power Point presentation to walk everyone through the document, how it started with a vision statement which was developed into a graphic, then into a draft framework, and finally into the draft management plan.

They started with the Existing Conditions Report to determine what was in the watershed at the current time. This will become Chapter 2 of the plan.

Issues were determined from WSIG member comments and using questionnaires distributed at presentations given by members of the WSIG at various agencies. From these questionnaires and comments a matrix of issues was developed. Issues were linked to different functions of the watershed.

Three workshops were held to determine how to address the issues and to link actions to the issues. A new action/issue matrix was developed which is not currently included in the plan, but could be if desired. Everyone was given a copy of this new matrix. It was suggested that you keep this matrix beside you as you review the draft plan.

The draft plan is divided into six sections:

1. Introduction
2. Existing Conditions Report
3. Issues of Concern/Goals and Objectives
4. Action Plan
5. Contributors
6. References

It is important for everyone to read Section 4.2 thoroughly and really understand it before reading the action section. You will find a lot of the criteria Weston used to support the actions.

Each action is also structured inside a table which summarizes the issue and action. If you can't read the entire document, it was suggested that you at least read these tables which summarize a lot of information.

If you feel that there are stakeholders that are not listed, it is important to let Weston know so they can be added.

At the bottom of the tables you will see types of actions such as:

- Management Planning and Coordination
- Modify Operation and Maintenance
- Best Management Practices
- Habitat Restoration/Enhancement
- Multi-benefit Projects
- Public Awareness and Involvement
- Fund Acquisition
- Monitoring and Assessment

It was asked how it was shown if an action would benefit more than one section such as water quality and habitat; would it be listed in both sections? Weston advised that it would be listed with complete context in the section it benefits the most, and referenced briefly in the other section.

For example, Section 4.4-5, Water Supply Section, on left is a list of several actions. It may show that it has water conservation benefits, but under other it would also benefit water quality, habitat, recreation, public awareness, etc.

The last part of the document is an extensive references section. This section will continue to evolve and grow. If you are aware of anything that is missing, please let Weston know.

Section 5 is the list of contributors, names of everyone who participated in creating the watershed plan whether it be providing photographs, documents, or participating in the workshops. Please let Weston know if anyone is missing from this list.

If you notice that some of the lines in the tables don't quite match up, this is due to use of a publishing program and how the document was set up for printing. There will not be a problem with the final printing.

From the very beginning there was the question of whether to go narrow and deep with a list of specific projects to accomplish or broad and shallow to cover more areas with less detail. Some members felt it would be hard for groups to get excited about the plan without at least some specific projects listed.

It was suggested that Weston create an Executive Summary to add to the plan that would highlight possible projects and capture current opportunities. But the plan does have to be designed to last for many years beyond anything current.

Another suggestion was that we need guiding principles for how to protect the watershed and what kinds of projects we should pursue. Maybe we could use the vision graphic (TV test pattern) and develop/list the policies/principles in the four boxes.

The WSIG can make recommendations or suggestions on what we'd like to see done, but ultimately it is the watershed council or those that come after this group who will decide. The council will decide what actions to take, what grants to apply for, what projects to do, what agencies are not paying attention to the plan that should be talked to, etc. The WSIG can only do our best and turn it over to the watershed council.

One way to develop the principles would be for each member to come up with 3-4 guidelines and get them to Weston, and then at the next meeting finalize them. Weston advised that there are principles in the document but not in a list format. They were what guided the team in developing the draft plan. They do have a list and can bring it to the next meeting. Jeff said that that would be a good starting point, and then members could review, edit the list, etc.

When writing a grant request, it is important that the grant project match the priorities of the watershed plan. Therefore, it is important that the plan identifies as many projects as possible to help make sure that your request matches and you have a better chance of getting the money. Projects could just be listed without any in depth details. Weston advised that it is true that some grants are very specific, but there are some that are very general.

Forest Service has worked with the JPA on trail plan conflicts, obtaining funding, unable to resolve trail issues.

#### **D) Plans and Protocols for Reviewing and Commenting on Draft Plan**

Members can comment and make suggestions on the draft plan in two ways, but both use the same format. You can take a form and fill it out by hand, or use the same form as a Word document and fill in on the computer. Electronic copy will be sent to Jeff to distribute. Be sure to reference the Section No. you are commenting on. Feedback should be emailed to Jeff. If necessary, you can call Weston to discuss extensive comments.

#### **E) Schedule**

Draft plan posted on web site	1/23/06
Review by TAC	1/26/06-3/6/09
WISG and TAC meeting	3/23/06
Weston incorporate feedback	3/10/06-3/30/06
Second draft plan posed	3/30/06
Public comment and review	3/30/06-5/16/06
Weston incorporate public feedback	5/16/06-6/15/06
Delivery of final document	6/15/06-6/30/06

#### **F) Follow-up on WSIG upon Completion of the Watershed Plan, e.g. a “Watershed Council”**

What are the alternatives to a Watershed Council? What are the functions of the council?

The Water Council needs to speak for the whole watershed and follow-up on issues. It needs to be made up of representatives who can commit to the objectives, and speak for the watershed plan. It could be a citizen’s group, JPA, or a conservancy, or a new group with some legal status. But, without a leader, nothing is likely to happen. We could request grant money to get a watershed council up and going.

Otay is in the process of forming a watershed council with representatives from each of the jurisdictions and Carlsbad already has one.

It was suggested that WSIG invite people from other plans and hear their thoughts on what works and what doesn’t.

Steve from Weston (Washington state) has worked with a lot of watershed councils and they can have a wide variety of roles, activities, and structures. Councils can do:

<i>Network design/monitoring</i>	<i>Field analytical work</i>
<i>Data management</i>	<i>Raise public awareness</i>
<i>Annual conference</i>	<i>Involve stakeholders</i>

The council structure can be:

<i>Executive network</i>	<i>Business/Industrial/Agricultural</i>
<i>Senior policy levels</i>	<i>Independent Science Advisory</i>
<i>Technical staff</i>	<i>Consultant</i>
<i>Citizens group</i>	<i>University Professor</i>

Roles might be:

*Watchdog*

*Enforcement*

*Education*

*Facilitation*

*Acquisition*

*Influence legislation*

*Implementation*

*Around TMDL's (total maximum daily load)*

Funding can come from:

*Federal/State appropriation*

*Federal/State grants*

*Loans*

*Bonds*

*Corporate Sponsor*

*Donations*

Some lessons learned on why some councils failed:

*Agencies involved, but they don't really commit their staff*

*Poorly defined roles and responsibilities, who does what, etc.*

*Lack of clear direction results in lack of interest*

*Lack of administrative champion (leader)*

Without a group that has an interest in keeping the objectives and principles going, the plan will just collect dust on a shelf.

Get the public involved in how to go forward and implement the plan. Get feedback from the public and various agencies with interests in the watershed. Maybe list some options. It could be a new or existing group such as a conservancy. If a new council is created it should have representatives from a broad spectrum of agencies and jurisdictions with interests in the watershed.

Maybe Weston could list a few alternatives/models and make that a part of the draft plan. This could be a separate section of the document, Adoption of plan and development of a Council or other alternative.

### **G) Set Date for Next Meeting**

March 23, 2006

Meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.