

Watershed Planning Guidance Group (WPGG) Minutes
July 28, 2005
Escondido City Hall

In attendance: Craig Adams (San Dieguito River Valley Conservancy), Chuck Badger (San Diego County Farm Bureau), Lynne Baker (Endangered Habitats League), Cathy Cibit (City of San Diego), Bob Collins (City of San Diego), Melanie Craig (Weston Solutions), Chuck DeMund (Ramona Chamber of Commerce), Steve Dime (San Dieguito Lagoon Committee), Paul Gebert (County Water Authority), Suzan Given (Weston Solutions), Peggy Goldstein (County of San Diego), Linda Niles (City of Del Mar), Bruce Posthumus (RWQCB), Gregg Sallee (Julian Planning), Bill Simmons (San Dieguito River Valley Conservancy/WPGG Vice Chairman), Mark Whitehead (WPGG Chairman), Jacqueline Winterer (Friends of San Dieguito River Park), Matt Witman (San Pasqual Valley Planning)

Meeting was called to order at 1:33 p.m. by Chairman Mark Whitehead.

A) Introductions

Mark welcomed Gregg Sallee and thanked him for coming back to the group.

B) Announcements

Cathy Cibit advised that the August meeting would probably be at the Escondido City Hall. The group will be discussing the plan framework.

Mark Whitehead asked if there were any changes to the June minutes. Minutes were approved as written.

C) Vision Statement

The Vision Statement has been revamped on the agenda and in the Power Point presentation. Cathy asked for comments on the new Vision Statement. Craig Adams said it was great, and it is time to take it out and see what others think.

D) Draft Matrix and Issues of Concern

New matrix on issues of concern was distributed along with key showing items 1-52.

Cathy also discussed the graphic of the Vision Statement which shows the heart of the matter is the vision. The inner circle shows categories and the outer ring shows things that affect them (stressors). Cathy acknowledged Dave Meyer who came up with the graphic concept of the vision statement. This graphic can be used to help develop strategies and the action plan. Craig commented that for communication purposes that the dots in the gray boxes in the four corners of the graphic show that they are for listing action items. Cathy said that was the purpose and it did say that in an earlier version but somehow was deleted from this one.

The color copy of the matrix is the working copy. It is better to use the black and white as it is easier to reproduce. It shows the issues of concern and which are not issues. The matrix will become an appendix to the main report, and is still being fine tuned. Under trampling, dogs are not a trampling issue, and this item needs to be removed. The new incompatible land use planning category encompasses the old communication and coordination category. Flooding, wildfire, and drought are natural consequences and are clarified with footnote H.

It was mentioned that the light shading is still hard to distinguish from the white. Cathy said they would work on that.

It was decided that positive values should not be included in this matrix, but on a separate matrix if necessary. Cathy asked for volunteers to work on that. It was later decided that this would not be needed at this time.

Bill Simmons mentioned that incompatible land use was not listed on the 2-page Key and felt it should be in listed in both places.

Mark Whitehead asked about the top headings on the matrix, "Water Supply and Social Resources." Why wouldn't it be "Water Resources?" Bruce Posthumus explained that water supply is water extracted for domestic, agricultural, or industrial uses. Social Resources include recreation, habitat that is in streams; social is not just water related. Cathy explained that these were very broad categories.

Mark questioned why the water at the western end of the river, which is being polluted by runoff, was listed according to the numbers under water supply and not social resources. Bruce said it was still used for recreation and habitat.

Mark asked what was the intended purpose of the matrix and the intended audience. Bruce said it was for any and everyone who is interested in the watershed, and it is for this group to help focus on what issues are out there, and which ones we should focus on in the action plan. Mark said if it is not an issue, then shouldn't the cell be left blank.

Jacqueline thought that agriculture in the middle watershed was very much an issue, but it is gray on the matrix. Advised that it is under Water Use, not Water Quality. Agriculture might be an indirect issue.

Craig Adams said that agriculture in the valley may be under threat from urban development or other sorts of things. This is where we could use a separate matrix to show opportunities and things we can protect or take advantage of.

Bill Simmons commented about land use planning and water supply in first three columns which show it is not a concern. Upper and middle watersheds boxes in the three columns should be white. Chuck DeMund explained that numbers 10, 18, 19, 24, 25, 29, 43, 45, 47 all fall under land use planning category, so it's not missing, it's scattered.

Mark Whitehead advised that the list of 52 items is not final, and there may be some duplications. He asked if it might be valuable to group the list, not the matrix, in some fashion, Upper, Lower, Middle, etc. Melanie said it would be better to list by category to avoid duplications. Chuck DeMund suggested that it might be less intimidating to have three different pages, Upper, Lower and Middle. Bruce thought that might work later when things are more finalized.

Steve Dime compared the matrix to a gauge, something like your car dashboard, you see pink areas, you see definitions, and get an overall view of the issues. Craig said it is also like a file cabinet. At a public outreach if someone suggests adding an issue, this gives you a way to place it in a category.

E) Power Point Presentation and Questionnaire

Mark Whitehead advised that the Power Point presentation and questionnaire were reviewed by the sub-committee which made suggestions. Melanie Craig did incorporate these suggestions into the presentation. Now it is time to take the presentation out to respective groups and show them what it is all about.

Melanie Craig went through the presentation and explained that there was not a lot of text on the slides, but they have provided a notes page with suggestions for what to talk about. She also thanked Craig Adams for many of the great pictures used in the presentation.

Bill Simmons asked if the words “basin” and “watershed” were interchangeable. Melanie said that yes there were. Chuck DeMund suggested removing the word “state” and making it just grants.

Melanie said individuals should feel free to modify the text as they see fit. She advised that the CD had a copy of the Power Point presentation and well as a pdf file of the presentation. The Power Point is a very large file so don't try to email it or it may cause PC crashes. You can email the pdf file.

Jacqueline Winterer felt that the graphic chart did not make sense. Steve Dime said that he uses charts all the time and it takes time to read and learn what each thing means. It's a standard systems management chart. Chuck DeMund said that the key to the chart is the four gray boxes in the corners which will be used to list action items. Maybe these boxes should be emphasized more.

Lynne Baker suggested taking the word “draft” out of the middle of the chart. She also questioned how social resources equates with the other three categories. Maybe put water quality on top and social resources on the bottom.

Bob Collins said this is a guideline to put the plan together, how to prioritize where to spend the money, what impacts are those actions going to have, what outside influences, mostly human, have on the whole thing. This can be the standard on how we make decisions, is action consistent with protect, enhance, conserve, etc. We don't have to agree on everything, but you have to

explain why don't like something. Bob mentioned that he is involved with another watershed, where there is no vision, no agreement, and they are struggling/fighting. Here we have an opportunity to come together and agree on how to conduct ourselves.

Mark Whitehead said that strategy makes a lot of sense. However, he agreed with Jacqueline that the chart is confusing as a means to that end. It might help to provide an example of an action item and how it impacts these things. Also, the words "protect" and "preserve," what is the difference? Mark said that if we who are in the know don't understand the chart and its relationship to the plan, then how can we expect our audience to understand.

Bob Collins said then we need to spend more time on it, bring back the definitions. Maybe the chart will end up being for internal use only.

Cathy said the gray boxes on the chart were to represent a collective force saying the action plan will be built on this foundation, but that is hard to show graphically. We will be developing strategies and action plans to bring it all together.

Chuck DeMund suggested removing the gray color from the four boxes. Steve Dime suggested putting a circle around the four categories, protection, enhancement, conservation, and preservation.

Jacqueline said that social resources include urbanization, everyone wants to live here. We have to provide them a way to do this without messing up other things. Housing is a big stressor. Melanie said that what they meant by social resources was more cultural resources and recreational resources that we want to protect.

Melanie Craig said they had no access to the County's 2020 plan, so used current SANDAG 2030 future plan and that will most likely change.

Cathy Cibit advised that members don't have to stay with the script, you can add, delete, or change to fit your particular knowledge and group.

Melanie Craig mentioned that some people have noticed that an area is being used in one way and shown differently on the map. Just remember that this is very general, we can't go in by hand and fix everything.

Craig felt the map needed some changes, add Santa Maria Creek, maybe Ramona and other towns.

Melanie mentioned that the Santa Ysabel tribe just recently broke ground on their casino. This might be an interesting fact to add to your presentation.

Melanie went over the questionnaire. Page 1 explains what the group is trying to do. There are three main questions. She would like to have responses back to her by September 30th.

Mark Whitehead asked about the draft watershed plan for public review, what is the process involved for that. Bob Collins said we would come together with a draft watershed plan to put out to the public for them to comment on the accuracy, any questions on what we have done, in hopes of getting comments back that the draft reflects that we are on the right path, that we've identified the concerns, correctly prioritized them, and then we develop a plan to put it out for public review, similar to an EIR. We may ask some of the group's members who will be doing the Power Point presentations to also do presentations on the draft plan. Following that would be the final plan which would also be put out for public review.

Bob explained per the contract with the State that there would be three outreaches. You will all be participating in the first one with the Power Point presentation you receive today. Hopefully you will want to participate in the second as well, or other arrangements can be made. The new Power Point presentation will show what's in the watershed plan, sort of an executive summary. It's important that those who represent jurisdictions talk their council or board members and department heads to make sure they are comfortable with what we've got here and where we are going so they don't feel blind sided when the plan comes out.

Mark Whitehead asked what would happen if one of the group presents the Power Point presentation to some planning group; can we assure them that they will get the file in time to review and comment. Cathy said there would be a 45-60 day comment period just like for an EIR. We would then take the comments and respond to them before preparing the final plan.

Bob said that we may have to extend schedule if the plan cannot be completed by May.

Bill Simmons said that he is confident that the group can go out and do presentations, but what about representatives who have not been attending the meetings. Who will contact their jurisdiction or agency to make sure we get their comments?

Bob tried to call the representative that were unable to make our meetings, but what will probably happen is we will have to call the jurisdictions and ask for feedback on how their council members and board members feel about it. Bob asked that any member who knew who we need to get in touch with to please let him know.

Steve Dime suggested that all the places visited on the field trips should get copies as they contributed also.

Craig said that someone should call representatives from the original list who are no longer coming to the meetings and let them know that someone needs do a presentation, we can offer to do it for them.

Cathy reminded people to at least contact their agencies right away and get on the agenda to do the presentation.

Craig suggested putting the web address on the last slide of the presentation; we need to really stress the web page. The presentation should also be put up on the web page.

Lynne Baker suggested putting the questionnaire on the web page; we might get a better response than just handing out paper copies.

Steve Dime suggested that there be a way for people to sign up on the web page to receive updated information.

Melanie Craig went over the questions on the questionnaire.

Bruce Posthumus, Craig Adams, and Chuck DeMund volunteered to revise the questionnaire. Mark suggested shortening it if possible. Cathy said she would like it back within one week.

F) Other

It was decided that we definitely need to do a brochure. Lynne Baker volunteered to try and find money for the brochure.

Mark suggested pulling information from the Power Point presentation.

Lynne said that there is a group at UCSD that has a 3-D model of the San Diego area showing all the watersheds, which might be digitized and provide better graphical data, like an aerial photo.

Lynne volunteered to go before the Del Mar City Council and ask for money. Cathy will check with the consultant on doing the brochure and the budget.

Lynne asked for volunteers to help with the brochure. Anyone interested contact Cathy or Bob.

Chuck DeMund said that the questionnaire should have one page with information that people could take home. Craig agreed that they should have something to take home that lists the web page, a list of the group and contact information, the vision statement, a time table, and how to stay in touch. Bob and Cathy agreed to work on that.

Mark mentioned that the updated version of the Power Point presentation will be posted on the web site. Cathy asked if the matrix could be posted on the web site.

It was asked when the updated questionnaire would be available. Cathy said within ten days, by August 8th. But go ahead and set up a date to do the presentations. Email Cathy with a list of groups and dates when you will be doing the presentations.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

Next meeting of the policy group will be August 25, 2005, at the Escondido City Hall.