

**Watershed Planning Guidance Group (WPGG) Minutes**  
**July 22, 2004**  
**Escondido City Hall**

**In attendance:**

Craig Adams (San Dieguito River Valley Conservancy), Chuck Badger (Farm Bureau), Liz Christensen (Rancho Santa Fe Association), Bob Collins (City of San Diego), Arlene Dea Deeley (City of San Diego), Chuck DeMund (Ramona Chamber of Commerce), Cheryl Filar (City of Escondido), Liz Giffen (County of San Diego), Lloyd Holt (Santa Fe Irrigation District), John Ingalls (Santa Fe Irrigation District), Lisa Kay (MEC), Dave Meyer (Rancho Bernardo Planning Board), Suzanne Michel (So. California Wetlands Recovery Project), Linda Niles (City of Del Mar), Chris Nyce (Cleveland National Forest), Jeff Pasek (City of San Diego), Bruce Posthumus (RWQCB), Phil Pryde (River Park JPA), Freda Reid (San Dieguito Lagoon Committee), Bill Simmons (WPGG Vice Chairman), Mark Whitehead (WPGG Chairman), Jacqueline Winterer, Matt Witman (San Pasqual Valley Planning)

Meeting was called to order at 1:31 p.m. by Chairman Mark Whitehead

1) **Introductions:** Tom White, Cleveland National Forest, who will be doing a presentation later.

2) **Approval of Minutes:** Jacqueline Winterer moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Phil Pryde. Minutes approved as written.

3) **Announcements:**

Suzanne Michel announced that WRP is co-sponsoring with the State Water Resources Control Board Clean Water Team a water quality workshop called Designing and Implementing a Water Quality Monitoring Strategy. It will be on August 23, 2004, 8:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. at Mission Trails Regional Park Visitors Center. This workshop will assist community-based organizations and educators to get their water quality monitoring programs up and running by asking the right questions and planning water quality strategy. If anyone is interested let her know and she will email all the information.

Craig Adams said that between now and the next meeting the San Dieguito River Park will be purchasing a 75 acre parcel in the lagoon area, the Beaudro Parcel along El Camino Real. There will also be purchases of three parcels totaling 800+ acres between Sutherland and San Ysabel Ranch west.

Chris Nyce mentioned that the Cleveland National Forest on Saturday will be hosting a one-day training session for anyone interested in volunteering for trail patrols. See him for details.

Dave Meyer announced that last month they were informed that the San Pasqual Vision Plan is starting to move forward and the Land Use and Housing Committee will be looking at the first two directives of the plan at a public meeting on August 4.

#### **4) Contract with Weston Solutions (MEC):**

Bob Collins said that the State has approved the changes to the Scope of Work. Lisa and her group have looked at the scope and divided up the responsibilities and are coming up with amounts for each of the tasks to be completed, and giving us a timeline. Hopefully start time for the contract with Weston Solutions will be around next meeting time or September 1.

#### **5) Issues of Concern:**

The issues of concern discussion involved a two-part process - Lisa Kay, Weston Solutions, prepared a presentation to get the WSIG group thinking about the future of the watershed - Bob Collins then lead the WSIG Group through a visualization exercise. He asked for three volunteers from the WSIG to discuss what they see the future to be in a portion of the San Dieguito River Watershed (lower, middle and upper). Mark Whitehead presented his views on the lower watershed, Jeff Pasek presented his views on the middle watershed, and Bill Simmons presented his vision for the upper watershed.

#### **Lisa Kay's Presentation:**

Bob said that he and Lisa had brainstormed on a way to get a good dialog going on the issues of concern. Based on what SANDAG is projecting for growth within this watershed, by 2030 the population within the San Dieguito River watershed will go up 60% and the density will go up substantially in Escondido and Ramona and other areas in the watershed. Lisa was asked to take a look into the future to see what impacts that growth would have on the watershed in terms of increased impervious layer, additional flow, etc. Lisa Kay presented slides of how the watershed currently looks and how it is projected to look in 2030 from SANDAG. Projections were made based on existing plans and on low density. Pollution amounts derived from model numbers were used from the 1980's, modeled after a wet year.

Bob suggested that SANDAG's projections and the impacts that it will have on the watershed should be the basis for the group to decide what we can do through the watershed plan to help influence how that growth takes place and lessen the impact.

Jacqueline Winterer asked if it would be possible to develop an equation where the amount of imported water minus the amount that goes into the sewer system would equal the amount of runoff. Bruce Posthumus advised that it is possible, but not that simple. You have to take into account rainfall, evaporation, percolation, groundwater, etc., as well as imported water. It would be easier to do based on the long term rather than the short term.

It was asked if there was good runoff and bad runoff. Yes, rain in open space provides good runoff; rain on impervious surfaces and from dry years provides bad runoff.

#### **Visualization Exercise:**

**Lower Watershed:** Mark Whitehead presented his views for the lower segment of the watershed. Mark would like to see the mouth of the San Dieguito Lagoon to the ocean opened and functioning. The lagoon suffers from bad runoff which is a serious issue and includes animal wastes from such places as the horses at the fairgrounds. The river at that point is very degraded and at risk. For most

of the year there is very little rainfall contributing to the river. The mouth of the lagoon is closed most of the time and for long periods of time. Even though there is no exchange of water from the ocean or from Lake Hodges during the dry periods, water mysteriously continues to accumulate at the mouth of the lagoon. One source of water may be subterranean with unknown quality. There are many golf courses that border the river which use fertilizer and the like. There is a danger of flooding, and expansion of impervious surfaces leads to increased runoff and flooding.

Need to improve control over planning, increase setbacks to river, to protect what water is there maybe use vegetation and shading, monitoring is called for to identify pollutants and where they are coming from. Need to make more use of detention basins and use more grass instead of asphalt.

Mark said that golf courses are considered casually as open space and therefore are desired, but there are more courses than needed for the population of the area, and he views them as a threat to water quality. Mark suggests we look at alternative uses for golf courses.

#### **Comments from other members of WSIG on Lower Watershed:**

Mark asked if it would be possible to allocate some water to the river, maybe at certain times of the year. Craig Adams advised that it could be done, would have to look at what your values are, look at tradeoffs, what costs are, look at historical regimen, what is natural situation, and analyze value of such an allocation. Suzanne Michel mentioned a good book on that subject of "Right to Water."

Phil Pryde mentioned the San Dieguito River Park Concept Plan which governs the focused area approximately in the middle of the watershed area. It is hoped that the community will coalesce around the vision of the plan and that it might extend outward to surrounding areas.

Jacqueline Winterer felt that there is a big public demand for beaches, but that the sand goes into the river mouth and closes it up.

Chris Nyce mentioned that his vision for 2030 was that he would be able to surf at the river mouth and not get sick.

**Middle Watershed:** Jeff Pasek presented his vision for the middle segment of the watershed and started by saying, keep agriculture in San Pasqual Valley and restore wetlands. There is a lot of vacant land that could be developed, most of it in the middle segment. More development means more impervious surfaces which means more runoff and more water containing pollutants going into Hodges. Water quality is poor and ways to fix it need to be developed.

Development will happen, but it can happen intelligently or foolishly. Smart growth policies such as clustering should be used. Clustering uses a minimum amount of land. To manage pollution, need sub-watershed storm water plans, not hundreds of individual plans that are not working together. Need to use source water protection guidelines to protect water quality. Any conversion of private land to public land is a good thing for water agencies and water quality.

#### **Comments from other members of WSIG on Middle Watershed:**

Mark Whitehead mentioned that cluster development has many advantages, easier to deal with runoff using detention basins for groups of homes, use of less pavement, etc.

Dave Meyer said that open space and recreational opportunities are important and any effort to enhance preservation of those areas is important. Dave would like to see Pamo Valley stay pretty much as it is. Dave mentioned that the City owns a huge chunk of property in Pamo Valley.

Freda Reid asked what effect Olivenhain Reservoir would have on Lake Hodges. It would have no effect on the area downstream from the dam as water could be pumped from Hodges up to Olivenhain to prevent Hodges from spilling as often as in the past.

Suzanne Michel said that we have a tremendous opportunity to consider the tool of planning for water quality protection. If you look at GP 2020 for example, the whole issue of water protection is just not there. The main concern of the MSCP and MHCP is habitat, but what doesn't get translated in these plans is that if you look at open space planning and good water quality you're going to get the best habitat.

Bruce Posthumus confirmed that we need to look at things collectively. A solution for one issue may make others worse. What can we do to deal with various threats?

Freda Reid was curious as to how transportation/roads fit into the picture. Which comes first the roads or the development? Usually one main road into the area to develop it, then other roads are put in as needed. Craig Adams mentioned that the stage that GP 2020 is at, a set of alternatives have been sent back for analysis. One of the main issues is traffic impact and level of service. Even before that the transnet tax extension is going to be on the ballot, and the widening Highway 67 is one of the items in the packet and one reason why a lot of groups will not be supporting it.

It was mentioned that GP 2020 has weak support of clustering, what is the opposition to clustering? Some of the planning commissions fear further development at a later date, a type of land banking. There would have to be language on clustering in the plan to make that not happen.

**Upper Watershed:** Bill Simmons presented his vision for the upper segment of the watershed. He would like to keep it as it is. The ranchettes above Lake Sutherland present some water quality issues. He envisions limited recreational possibilities, right now there are no trails, would like to see trails for horses, hikers, and possibly bikes. Growth and development need to be limited and that's where GP 2020 will come in as well as the purchase of private land for the park. We need to keep on the table acquiring land and open space easements. We need a management plan for habitat and recreation protection. Pamo Valley also needs a management plan. Boden Canyon has four or five public ownerships, City, County, Fish and Game, but no planning. Fish and Game wants hunting and fishing there. All the owners need to work together to protect the area. As for MSCP, nothing is being done. This group can do a lot. We need to move forward and complete the management plans. Also, we need to provide trails to Volcan Mountain and reopen it for use.

#### **Comments from other members of WSIG on Upper Watershed:**

Jeff Pasek remarked that the Cleveland National Forest who have managed the forest for more than 100 years is a good example of how to manage.

If the WSIG group approves, Bob would like to schedule three field trips, one to each segment of the watershed, lower, middle, and upper.

**6) Presentation by the Cleveland National Forest – Tom White:**

There are four forests between Monterey and the border of the United States which contain 3.5 million acres of land. The last Forest Plan was approved in 1986, equivalent of the County general plan. Tom had cd's with the plan for all four forests, including maps which were available for anyone interested. Some of the primary issues are:

- Urban spread – people moving into the area
- Greater recreational use (dirt bikes, off-roading)
- Grazing used to be predominate, now dropped down
- How to control use of forest land

Currently they are in the middle of a 90 day comment period on the plan. Tom demonstrated how to find the part of the plan on the web site that would pertain to the San Dieguito River watershed. You can go to the web site and view maps, add your comments, etc., at [www.fs.fed.us/r5/scfpr](http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/scfpr).

The plan is in a new format, it's more strategic. Part 1 is the vision, part 2 is strategy, and part 3 is rules and regulations.

**7) Presentation on Water Quality – Jeff Pasek:**

Jeff discussed water quality from a drinking water perspective. San Diego gets 80% of its water from outside sources and only 20% is local runoff captured in reservoirs. Imported water is also stored in the reservoirs at times. Approximately 40% of the total water supply spends some time in the local reservoirs.

The City supplies water directly to 1.3 million people, and about 200,000 people outside the city such as Del Mar, Coronado, etc. Most of our reservoirs are located outside the city. Approximately 1.6 million people in San Diego County receive at least some of their water from our local reservoirs. The City owns about 6% of the land in the watershed where their reservoirs are located and 97% of those watersheds are outside the City of San Diego.

Mark asked how it was that the City's land ownership, though small, was all next to rivers. Jeff explained that the land was acquired for the purpose of building dams to create reservoirs for holding water. Mark mentioned that Pamo Valley had nothing to do with water. Jeff said that it was acquired with the idea of building a dam there.

There are two bodies of Federal law and State law that govern water quality.

- Clean Water Act – protects surface bodies of water and groundwater
- Safe Drinking Water Act – protects quality of drinking water

Multiple barriers are used by the City to produce quality drinking water:

- Source protection
- Filtration
- Disinfection
- Secondary disinfection system
- Monitoring and compliance

Pollutants of concern (POC) that impact the City's reservoirs are:

Taste and odor are the number 1 complaint about drinking water.

Nutrients – algae – organic carbon + chlorine = DBD

Organic carbon

Total dissolved solids (TDS) (salts) Hodges has a real problem

Cryptosporidium parvum (parasite) - 1995 in Milwaukee caused more than 100 deaths.

Sources of contamination which impact the City's source water are:

Residential and commercial development

Excess irrigation and fertilization

Septic systems

Agriculture to some extent

Wastewater discharge

Sewage spills

Initiatives for source water protection are located on the USEPAS web site:

USEPA has recently issued a commitment to watershed protection process, the web site is

[www.epa.gov/owow/watershed/memo.html](http://www.epa.gov/owow/watershed/memo.html)

1996 amendment to the Safe Drinking Water Act added requirements for drinking water or source water protection.

The City of San Diego Water Department developed their own document called "Source Water Protection Guidelines" to be used by land developers and other agencies within the watersheds. This document was just finished and in the process of figuring out how it will be distributed.

Bob Collins explained that these guidelines are voluntary, the Safe Drinking Water Act does not give us any teeth to enforce them. What the City has to do is figure out how to use the document internally. We are going to try to come up with a strategy to get internal City approval for use of the guidelines. We've talked to the County about the guidelines. Because of concerns for the storm water guidelines we need to give the San Diego region some time to digest what we are trying to accomplish with storm water and then suggest that our guidelines be looked at. Hopefully we will get the San Diego Region (community) to embrace the guidelines.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Next meeting will be Thursday, August 26, at the Escondido City Hall, Training Room No. 1, from 1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.