Summary of San Diego Basin Study Public Workshop

August. 2nd 2017
San Diego County Water Authority

Meeting Recap:
During the Aug. 2nd IRWM RAC Meeting, the San Diego Basin Study Technical Team presented information about the project and its current status. The Team provided an opportunity for RAC members and public participants to give feedback on the draft Evaluation Objectives to be used in the San Diego Basin Study Tradeoff Analysis (Task 2.5).

Outcomes:

- Task 2.3 Interim Report completed and posted on the Basin Study website
- Provided overview of Task 2.4 and the finalized portfolios to be utilized for the appraisal level and trade-off analysis
- Reviewed the goals and approach of the trade-off analysis (Task 2.5)
- Received public stakeholder feedback on the potential Evaluation Objectives and associated performance measures, which serve as criteria to assess portfolios in the trade-off analysis

Summary of Stakeholder Feedback on Draft Evaluation Objectives:
Below is a *high-level* summary of the comments we received during the breakout session.

Many groups recommended additional Evaluation Objectives be added. These include:

- *Climate Resilience* (resilience to extreme weather, floods, fire, sea level rise, and other impacts of climate change). Given the focus of the study, several groups emphasized the importance to evaluate portfolios on their ability to reduce the impacts of climate change and bolster resilience of the region.
- *Environmental Justice*. Several groups highlighted the need to pull this performance measure out of "Protect Quality of Life" and add it as an Objective. Several performance measures were suggested to potentially include in an Environmental Justice Objective: Vulnerability to climate change, Access to reliable or cost effective drinking water, and Equity/distribution of projects throughout the basin (e.g., percentage of population served, number of member agencies served, or number of DACs served)
- *Portfolio Complexity* (e.g., challenges associated with permitting, regulatory compliance, property ownership, number of agencies involved)
- *Community Involvement/Engagement* (or add as a performance measure under a related objective)
- *Synergistic Effects/Proximity to other projects/Regional Integration and Coordination*
- *Multiple Benefits*. It was recommended to add this objective to the list to give portfolios that achieve multiple benefits a higher score in the trade off analysis
- *Water Quality and Watersheds* (and/or revise the Objective, *Protect Habitats, Wildlife, & Ecosystem Services* to *Protect Watersheds, Wildlife, & Ecosystem Services*).
- *Public Opinion/Acceptance/Practicality of Implementation* (or add as a performance measure under a related objective)

Other suggested changes to existing Objectives or performance measures:

- Revise *Manage Cost and Provide Affordability to Cost Effectiveness*
- Revise *Reduce Carbon Footprint* to *Address climate change through greenhouse gas reduction*
- Add a performance measure, "Tourism Impact," to *Regional Economic Impact*
- Add a performance measure, "Impact to listed water bodies," to *Protect Watersheds, Wildlife, & Ecosystem Services*
- Emphasize value of upland habitats in the list of performance measures for *Protect Watersheds, Wildlife, & Ecosystem Services*
- Add a performance measure, "Percent imported supply" to *Optimize Local Control/Independence*

Other General Comments:

- To the extent possible, use simple terms for the Evaluation Objectives
- In an effort to reduce bias and improve scoring consistency, develop explicit scoring criteria for qualitative performance measures (e.g., define what constitutes a score of 1 versus 2, 3, etc.) *before* the scoring process begins.
- Suggest alternative wording to *Optimize Local Control/Independence* (e.g., use different word for "control" or remove)

A few clarifying comments: What is the broader goal of the Basin Study? How can you use the Basin Study?

The Basin Study will be analyzing approaches our region can take to address the impacts related to climate change and demand increases on our water resources. An important clarification is that the Study is meant to quantify the utility of different types of climate adaptation approaches/concepts across the 21st century, not the specific projects themselves. The modeling in the Study incorporates existing and currently proposed projects into portfolios, combining different adaptation approaches to prepare the study area's water supply system for the challenges of the future. The model output is not designed to produce a ranking of projects, which would only be useful for a short window of time. Instead, Study outputs are geared toward indicating the relative utility and value of different climate adaptation approaches (e.g., desalination vs. conservation vs. greywater reuse, etc.) to see their overall benefits to the region. A broader goal of the Study is to help inform future decision-making related to project design and development. The Study results are intended to be useful in years to come as a reference in funding applications to defend the utility and value of the proposed conceptual projects or other new projects that fit within the scope of the portfolios and/or adaptation concepts evaluated in the study.

Next Steps:

We will be reaching back out for additional feedback in the next few months as it relates to the revised list of Evaluation Objectives, the trade-off analysis process, and the development of weighted scores for Evaluation Objectives.

Contact:

Sarah Brower, City of San Diego, sbrower@sandiego.gov
Andrew Funk, City of San Diego, afunk@sandiego.gov
Allison Danner, Bureau of Reclamation, adanner@usbr.gov
Leslie Cleveland, Bureau of Reclamation, lcleveland@usbr.gov
Goldy Herbon, San Diego County Water Authority, gherbon@sdcwa.org