

APPENDIX B

LIST OF PREPARERS AND REVIEWERS

This page left intentionally blank

LIST OF PREPARES AND REVIEWERS

PREPARERS

The County of San Diego (Department of Planning and Land Use) and the San Diego River Watershed Work Group (WWG) prepared this Watershed Management Plan under contract to the State Water Resources Control Board. Lead WWG members who participated in the preparation of this document included:

County of San Diego

Elizabeth Giffen Land Use/Environmental Planner II, San Diego River Watershed Project Manager
Teresa Brownyard Land Use and Environment Group Grants Coordinator

San Diego River WWG

Rob Hutsel San Diego River Park Foundation Executive Director

Study Team

Anchor Environmental CA, L.P.

Lennie Rae Cooke Principal Author/Project Manager/Water Quality
David Keith Contract Manager/Geological Resources
Nicole Lombre Technical Editor/Document Preparation

Everest International Consultants

David Cannon

KTU+A

Mark Carpenter, Land Use and Planning
Joe Punsalan, GIS

Merkel and Associates

Keith Merkel, Biological Resources
Edward Ervin, Biological Resources

Michael Welch and Associates

Michael Welch, Groundwater/Surface Water Supply

REVIEWERS AND COMMENTERS

The following individuals, on behalf of their respective agencies and organizations, provided comments and input to this Watershed Management Plan:

Chiara Clemente	California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego
Steven DiDonna	County of San Diego, Public Works Department
Julie Hampel	City of El Cajon
Jeff Pasek	City of San Diego Water Department
Cathy Cibit	City of San Diego Water Department
Christine Rothman	City of San Diego Metropolitan Wastewater District
Harold Bailey	Padre Dam Municipal Water District
Deborah Jayne	San Diego River Conservancy

APPENDIX C

COMMENT AND RESPONSES TO DRAFT

This page left intentionally blank

DRAFT WMP
COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

As part of the transparent, public process that has been prominent during the development of the watershed management plan, the comments by reviewers and the responses from the Study Team are informally provided below. The name and association of the commenter is shown above the comment, and the name of the Team member who responded is in bold immediately following.

FROM: JULIE HAMPEL, CITY OF EL CAJON

I didn't have a lot of time to review, but looked through the document and have the following comments: 1. Slide (Why undertake a watershed management plan?) - was promoting healthy/sustainable hydrological patterns ever discussed. Since our permit requires jurisdictions to manage water quantity (to pre-construction flow rates), shouldn't the hydrological aspect be included? 2.Slide (Benefits) - Following along that same SUSMP- hydrological flow management; add sustainable water levels to the benefits list. 3. I did not understand the impervious area maps. Is it possible to provide some additional explanation.

It is a very nice document. Easy to follow.

ANCHOR

Comments on PowerPoint presentation noted and appreciated. These comments may appropriately be integrated into next task deliverable.

FROM: CHRISTINE ROTHMAN, CITY OF SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN WASTEWATER, DEPARTMENT OF STORMWATER PROGRAM

Where you have noted "Local jurisdictional" support or activity (particularly in the Implementation Schedule - Table 5-1) we request that you please add a footnote to say "as funding and staff allow."

ANCHOR

Requested modification made.

FROM: CATHY CIBIT, CITY OF SAN DIEGO WATER DEPARTMENT

1. Overall Comments
 - replace the term "vacant" with "undeveloped" throughout the report

KTUA

Text and tables modified as requested. I have corrected all of the text within the sections.

- replace subjective terminology with factual terminology throughout the report (example: pg. 43, first sentence.."Unfortunately, most individuals cannot define a watershed much less understand the..."

ANCHOR

Comment noted and an attempt to remove subjective terminology will be made.

2. Introduction:

- include a statement regarding the national significance of this river and the recent formation of the San Diego River Conservancy.

ANCHOR

SDR Conservancy and its role are described in the Assessment.

- include a statement about the rich cultural resources such as the numerous village sites and features (Padre Dam) along this river.

ANCHOR

Requested modification made.

- include local regulations that would need to be complied with along with state and federal agencies.

ANCHOR

Requested modification made.

3. Section 1.2.1 Watershed Management Planning Tools

- include implementing ordinances as a tool

ANCHOR

Requested modification made.

4. Section 2.1

- Throughout the report, use lower case for common plant, animal and habitat names unless a proper name is warranted (example: least Bell's vireo).

ANCHOR

Comment noted. Text to remain as is for consistency with other documentation produced through this program.

- include a statement again about the rich cultural resources in this watershed.

ANCHOR

Requested modification made.

5. Section 2.6

- Page 17: include scientific name for San Diego thornmint; replace Turn with tern.
- verify the presence of Quino checkerspot in this management area.

MERKEL

Acanthomintha ilicifolia

Tern

We are citing the record from 1960 from the Mission Trails Regional Park area that exists in the USFWS database

6. Section 2.7.3

- Page 24: I believe Barona Indian Reservation owns rather than manages 6,823 acres ...

KTUA

Comment noted. See also Comment 27 from J. Pasek.

7. Section 3.1

- Page 29, second paragraph: I think the first sentence would read better as follows: There are no stream flow monitoring gauges along Forester Creek or San Vicente Creek. These creeks are located within the San Diego Management Area. Stream flow data is important.....

EVEREST

Agreed. Replaced the second paragraph on Page 29 with the following paragraph.

No stream flow monitoring gauges are located along Forester Creek or San Vicente Creek. These creeks are located within the San Diego Management Area. Stream flow data are important for providing and maintaining adequate levels of flood protection along these creeks, especially Forester Creek which is highly urbanized. In addition, these data would be of importance to water quality control and Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) development efforts. The flow and stage data from the reinstated station would aid in flood hazard analysis of the flood-prone Forester Creek sub-basin.

8. Section 3.3 Groundwater

- this section needs to include more information about the significant groundwater problems and issues that the San Vicente Mangement Area is experiencing due to compounding problems with drought and overuse of wells. The Lakeside area, for example, has been experiencing significant problems with groundwater wells especially since the development of the Barona casino.

WELCH

Comment addressed and change made to document.

9. Section 3.5.1, Page 35

- second line: replace “terrestrial” with “habitat”

MERKEL

Modification made.

- eighth line: replace “impairment” with “ impacts”

MERKEL

Modification made.

10. Section 3.5.2, second paragraph, first sentence:

- this sentence may read better as follows: Restoring native habitats in conjunction with the removal of invasives is important to achieving a balanced ecosystems.

MERKEL

Modification made.

- Page 37, last paragraph, third line: Should ..”and habitat restoration”.... be deleted?

MERKEL

Modification made.

11. Section 4.4.1, page 45

- add the term “unpredictability” to second sentence regarding fractured rock aquifers

WELCH

Comment addressed and change made to document.

- 12. Section 5.2, Table 5-1, Page 58: include comments from the 12/10/04 meeting as follows:
 - overall, remove dates and add approx. amount of time to do action times (6 months; one year, etc);
 - provide a list of projects to do in the watershed
 - instead of prioritizing, come up with another term to indicate a level of importance
 - change the "Interagency Category" to "Stakeholder Cooperation".
 - change WWG to Watershed Group.

ANCHOR

Modification made. Consensus on the construction of Table 5-1 reached by consensus of the WWG

- 13. Section 5.5, Page 66
 - add funding mechanisms, strategies, web sites, partnering opportunities.
 - add implementation strategies included but not limited to types of agencies or equivalent recognized groups that could be created to carry this forward in the future.
 - Need a “roadmap” for the future to get projects implemented.

ANCHOR

Funding section has been completed and, in combination with Table 5-1, the requested information is provided. Table 5-2 is the “roadmap” for project implementation and was created by consensus by the WWG.

FROM: J. PASEK, THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO WATER DEPARTMENT

Generally, comments are identified by section or page number, or both. Specific text from the document is shown in quotations. Text to be insert is shown as **underlined and bold** and text to be deleted is shown as ~~strikeout~~. Many of the comments also have some explanations. Comments A though D are general in nature, while the comments beginning at “1” are more specific.

A] Hydromodification versus imperviousness. In several places in the Plan, “hydromodification” is described as including channel modifications, scouring, erosion, and imperviousness. I believe imperviousness [i.e., amount of impervious cover] should be a separate category from the other types of hydromodification. That is to say, imperviousness is not a type of hydromodification. In some parts of the Plan imperviousness is discussed separately from hydromodification, in other parts they are lumped together.

KTUA

KTUA has addressed this comment in Sections 3 and 4.

B] There is some repetition in the document. There are blocks of text that are repeated, largely intact, twice or three times. It would be well to search these out and try to eliminate the repetitions. An example is the description of the groundwater resources.....the same text appears in Sections 2.4 and 3.3, and some of the text appears again in Section 4.4.

WELCH

Revisions made.

C] Generally, the importance and value of the San Diego River and its watershed as a source of municipal water supply from surface water is not given much weight or emphasis anywhere in the Plan. There is lots of discussion of groundwater as a source of water supply, but surface water sources gets much less attention. It seems that surface water as a source of municipal supply is taken more or less for granted. In the SDRW, local surface runoff captured in the five reservoirs supplies far more water to our communities than groundwater ever has or ever will. In meetings of the Watershed Work Group in November we talked about the importance of surface water supplies, and we agreed that sustaining current surface water supplies is an important issue of concern for the Plan. I'm hoping that the content of our discussion at these meetings will be incorporated into the Plan.

WELCH

Additional focus placed on reservoirs and surface water supply.

D] Many of the figures in Appendix A are not referenced or described anywhere in the text. Most of the figures in Appendix A are not numbered in a way that corresponds to the sections of text that is best associated with each figure. For example, I would expect the figure titled "Population Density 2000" [which is numbered 1-12] to be numbered 2-x, because population is discussed in Chapter 2 / Section 2.7.

Every figure should be described or referenced somewhere in the text. Then, every figure should be numbered to correspond to the chapter where it is described. [This comment is repeated in #31, below.]

ANCHOR

Figures are to remain as they are. In this document, the Assessment figures are referenced as needed to support the text. The primary reason to keep the figures as referenced in the Assessment is that not all figures are referenced in the WMP but all the figures are important to understanding the watershed. As a "set," they tell a story of the SDRW.

1] section 1.2.1, p.4.

"Available planning tools that assisted in the development of the SDRWMP fall mainly into four categories " But there follows only three categories. Did something get left out? Or should it read "three categories"?

ANCHOR

Changed to three categories, and added additional implementing regulations.

2] section 1.2.1, p.4. Section titled "Regulations and Regulatory Reports

insert the words "federal" and "state" as follows:

- The **federal** Clean Water Act (CWA)
- The **state** Porter - Cologne Act

Also suggest adding in this section **the federal Safe Drinking Water Act** and **the state Safe Drinking Water Act**. Note that the federal and state Safe Drinking Water Acts have the same names.

ANCHOR

Modifications made.

3] section 2.1, p.5, first paragraph, first sentence.

“The SDRW is the second largest watershed (440 square miles) **entirely within** in San Diego County

The Tijuana River Watershed and the desert watersheds are larger than any others, but they are only partly in SD County.

ANCHOR

Modifications made.

4]] section 2.1, p.5, second paragraph, last sentence.

“ ...tributaries to the San Diego River include Boulder Creek, ... as shown in Appendix A (Figure 1-3 **Figure 1-1**).” Figure 1-1 is Surface Water Hydrology; Figure 1-3 is Topography. Perhaps Figure 1-3 should be referenced near the start of this paragraph, where elevations and the layout of the river are discussed.

ANCHOR

Modification made.

5] Appendix A, Figures.

General comment. Most of the figures display the names of the County of SD community planning areas; e.g., “Valle de Oro;” e.g., “Central Mountain.” These are usually shown in purple. These community planning areas really don’t relate well to anything in the watershed, and I recommend removing these altogether from all maps. If there’s a need to use community names for the purpose of providing geographic reference, I would limit it to the following: Julian, Ramona, Alpine, Descanso, Lakeside, Santee, El Cajon, La Mesa, and San Diego.

KTUA

Community Planning and Subregional Areas are included here to be consistent with the County General Plan and Community Plans. Figures are to remain as they are. In this document, the Assessment figures are referenced as needed to support the text. The primary reason to keep the figures as referenced in the Assessment is that not all figures are referenced in the WMP but all the figures are important to understanding the watershed. As a “set,” they tell a story of the SDRW.

6]] section 2.1, p.5, third paragraph, second sentence.

“ ... the watershed can be divided into these management areas from geographic and land use perspectives, and because these sub-basins are essentially hydraulically disconnected, ...”

The term “hydraulically disconnected” needs to given some explanation or context. It is explained elsewhere [e.g., section 2.2] in the Plan, but this is the first time most readers will encounter the term. Perhaps insert the following after the first sentence:

“The El Capitan Management Area and the San Vicente Management Area are distinguished by the presence of El Capitan Dam and San Vicente Dam, respectively. These dams effectively break the hydraulic continuity between the two upper management areas and the lower San Diego Management Area.”

ANCHOR

Modification made.

7] section 2.1, page 6, first paragraph.

“Threats ... include: water quality degradation; ...flooding; ~~aggregate mining operations~~ **hydromodification**; and ...”

This list is the results of human activities, whereas aggregate mining is a human activity itself [that cause degradation]. Aggregate mining is to hydromodification as automobiles use is to heavy metals.

ANCHOR

Comment addressed.

8] section 2.2, page 6, second paragraph, second sentence

“~~As discussed previously, p-~~ Precipitation is highly seasonal ...”

Not discussed previously.

ANCHOR

Comment addressed.

9] section 2.2, p.6, last paragraph; recommend changing to:

“In the El Capitan Management Area and ~~the~~, San Vicente Management Area, ~~and San Diego Management Area~~ surface runoff is collected **impounded** by the El Capitan Reservoir, ~~and~~ San Vicente Reservoirs, ~~and~~ Surface runoff in the San Diego Management Area flows to the Pacific Ocean. ~~, respectively.~~”

Cleaned up this becomes

“In the El Capitan Management Area and the San Vicente Management Area surface runoff is impounded by El Capitan and San Vicente Reservoirs. Surface runoff in the San Diego Management Area flows to the Pacific Ocean.”

ANCHOR

Modification made.

10] p. 7, Table 2-2

Need to add El Capitan Reservoir to the El Capitan Mgt Area. Need to add Lake Jennings and Lake Murray to the San Diego Mgt. Area. In the San Diego Mgt Area need to add Alvarado Creek [although it is not a large creek, it is familiar to a lot of people]. In the San Vicente Mgt Area, “West Branch” is more properly West Branch of San Vicente Creek, or at least, West Branch Creek.

EVEREST

Everest agrees with the comment and recommends the replacement of Table 2-2 with the following table.

Table 2-2

Stream Network of the SDRW

<i>Management Area</i>	<i>Stream/Waterbody</i>
<i>El Capitan</i>	<i>El Capitan Reservoir</i>
	<i>Cuyamaca Reservoir</i>
	<i>San Diego River</i>

	<i>Boulder Creek</i>
	<i>Cedar Creek</i>
	<i>Ritchie Creek</i>
	<i>Kelly Creek</i>
	<i>Isham Creek</i>
	<i>Sand Creek</i>
	<i>Peutz Creek</i>
<i>San Vicente</i>	<i>San Vicente Reservoir</i>
	<i>San Vicente Creek</i>
	<i>Swartz Canyon Creek</i>
	<i>Klondike Creek</i>
	<i>Santa Ana Creek</i>
	<i>Longs Gulch</i>
	<i>West Branch Creek</i>
	<i>Padre Barona Creek</i>
<i>San Diego</i>	<i>San Diego River Estuary</i>
	<i>Forester Creek</i>
	<i>Lower San Vicente Creek</i>
	<i>Los Coches Creek</i>
	<i>Wildcat Canyon Creek</i>
	<i>Little Sycamore Canyon Creek</i>
	<i>Oak Canyon Creek</i>
	<i>Murphy Canyon Creek</i>
	<i>Alvarado Creek</i>
	<i>Lake Jennings</i>
	<i>Lake Murray</i>

11] page 9 & 10, section 2.3; and Figure 1-4

The text on pages 9 & 10 name the 303d and monitoring list waterbodies, and Figure 1-4 has a numbered symbol on the map for each. There needs to be a table that relates the name of the waterbody to the numbered symbol on the map. For example, on Figure 1-4 the number 3 in a red square is Chocolate Creek.

ANCHOR

Comment addressed.

12] Section 2.4, page 11, San Vicente Management Area

This section should make reference to the significant groundwater problems and issues that the San Vicente Management Area is experiencing due to compounding problems of drought and overuse, especially in the Barona area. The problems are described in Section 3.4 [p. 34], but should be summarized here.

WELCH

Comment addressed.

13] section 2.4, page 11, last paragraph

“The San Diego Basin Management Area is ~~dominated~~ **characterized** by large alluvial aquifers, ...”

“Dominated” is probably a little overstated.

WELCH

Modification made.

14] Section 2.5, page 12, second paragraph, third sentence

~~“Groundwater also serves as a source of water supply within the Capitan Grande Indian Reservation.”~~

Although this is a true statement, I would strike it completely because there is only one house on the entire Capitan Grande Reservation, so its kinda trivial. The Capitan Grande Reservation is very large, but has just one residence.

WELCH

Significant re-write of section 2.5.

15] Section 2.5, page 12, third paragraph, first sentence

~~“ No surface water diversions occur along the surface streams of the El Capitan Management Area, but w~~ **Water** supply is developed from two surface water reservoirs within the El Capitan Management Area.”

Technically, and in the jargon of hydrologist and water resource specialist, a dam is a surface water diversion.

WELCH

Significant re-write of section 2.5.

15] Section 2.5, page 12 & 13

Also note that throughout the rural areas there are many small earthen dams on small tributary streams. These form “stock ponds” ranging from a fraction of an acre to several acres. All are diversions in that they take water out of the natural water courses and put the water to a use.

WELCH

Significant re-write of section 2.5.

16] In Section 2.5 and elsewhere

When writing about water resources, it would be well to use “City of San Diego Water Department” or “SDWD” in place of “City of San Diego.” Note that the list of acronyms at the beginning of the document has SDWD = City of San Diego Water Department.

ANCHOR

Modification made.

17] list of acronyms, page iv

“GP2020 County of San Diego General Plan Update”

ANCHOR

Modification made.

18] Section 2.5, page 14, first paragraph

“Groundwater from the Santee/El Monte Basin **presently** serves as a source of municipal supply to Helix Water District, Lakeside Water District, and Riverview Water District; **and historically has supplied the City of San Diego Water Department.**”

WELCH

Significant re-write of section 2.5.

19]] Section 2.5, page 14, second paragraph

“ No public water supplies are ~~being~~ developed by municipal agencies ~~within~~ **from** the Mission Valley basin ~~and El Cajon basin~~. **However, the City of San Diego Water Department has historically drawn water from the Mission Valley basin, and is moving toward re-establishing these sources. In the El Cajon Basin a single large capacity well presently supplies water to the City of San Diego Water Department; there are no other municipal water supply wells in the El Cajon basin.**”

Regarding my comments #18 and #19 The whole business of groundwater rights and groundwater use along the lower San Diego River is complicated and potentially very litigious. The San Diego River Watershed Group hasn't discussed these legal matters at all, and the Plan should try to steer away from the topic. However, it is important that the current and historical use of groundwater by the SDWD be noted, and I would not be serving the SDWD well if I didn't ask to get these comments inserted.

WELCH

Significant re-write of section 2.5.

20] section 2.6, page 16, second paragraph, fourth sentence

“The warm water habitats of this management area also support a suite of ~~exotic~~ **non-native** warm water fishes”

“Exotic” has a generally negative connotation [e.g., exotic plants such as arrundo]. Most people don't see bass and sunfish negatively.

MERKEL

Modification made.

21] section 2.6, page 16, second paragraph, last sentence

“No native fish species are known to occur in the [El Capitan] management area (TAIC and USGS 2002).”

Well, hmm

I believe its pretty well acknowledged that coastal rainbow trout [*Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus*] are native to the San Diego River. Although the pre-European populations probably have been replaced by hatchery fish that are not locally derived, it remains the case that there are resident rainbow trout populations in the SD River drainage.

I don't know what you should do with this. Maybe the following:

“It has been reported that no native fish species occur in the management area (TAIC and USGS 2002). **However, most experts acknowledged that coastal rainbow trout [*Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus*] are native to the San Diego River, and although the pre-European populations probably have been replaced by hatchery fish, there are today resident rainbow trout populations in the SD River drainage.**”

MERKEL

Text to remain as originally stated.

Backround: The text I composed & my response to the comment above are both based on the history of the watershed, known verifiable animal records, and follow up fish studies of the region and watershed.

Response to comment: The introduction of hatchery stock trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss var.) into Lake Cuyamaca, located in the headwaters of Boulder Creek, San Diego River watershed has been taking place for about a century. There are no records of trout from Boulder Creek prior to the stocking of trout into Lake Cuyamaca. As a result, the resident fish population in Boulder Creek, located between Lake Cuyamaca dam and the confluence of the San Diego River is considered to consist of an established breeding population of an introduced hybrid strain (Oncorhynchus mykiss var.), not to be confused with a relic population of native rainbow trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus), nor a population of genetic admixture of hatchery hybrid and native varieties.

Historical records for steelhead occurring in the San Diego River in our San Diego Management Area are recognized and are included in the larger document titled San Diego River Watershed Management Plan: Baseline Assessment, March 2004. Also, professional ichthyologists (i.e., ‘experts’) for our region do not recognize O. m. irideus having historically occurred or as currently occurring in Boulder Creek within the El Capitan Management Area.

22] Section 2.7.2, page 20, first paragraph, first sentence

“Impervious surfaces (asphalt, concrete, roofs, and to some degree ~~grass~~ turf) increases surface.....”

ANCHOR

Modification made.

23] Section 2.7.2, page 20, first paragraph, second sentence

KTUA

“... that are directly linked to current to hydrologic modifications ...”

Impervious surfaces (asphalt, concrete, roofs, and to some degree turf) increases surface water runoff. Many water quality related plans and programs have acknowledged that past construction techniques and development patterns have created large expanses of impervious surfaces that are directly linked to current hydrologic modifications and water quality problems. Therefore, imperviousness has been identified as a primary indicator to measure the impacts of land development within a watershed.

(revised entire first paragraph)

24] Section 2.7.2, page 21, first paragraph, second sentence

“For non-supporting watersheds the objective then becomes to protect ..”

KTUA

A sensitive watershed is characterized by stable stream channels, good water quality, and good to excellent aquatic biodiversity. A sensitive watershed should be the most protected category with zoning, site impervious restrictions, stream buffers, and stormwater practices applied to maintain predevelopment stream quality. An impacted watershed in characterized by unstable stream channels, fair water quality, and fair to good aquatic biodiversity. Actions within an impacted

watershed should focus on maintaining critical elements of the stream system and reducing nutrient and metal loads in addition to the actions of a sensitive watershed. A non-supporting watershed is characterized by highly unstable stream channels, fair to poor water quality, and poor aquatic biodiversity. Non-supporting watersheds cannot maintain predevelopment channel stability and biodiversity, even when stormwater practices and zoning restrictions are fully applied. For non-supporting watersheds the objective then becomes to protect the downstream water quality by removing pollutants, controlling bacteria, and restore aquatic habitats in degraded streams wherever feasible [citation provided.]

25] Table 2-4 shows Poway’s imperviousness as zero acres and 0%. I guess that’s because the area of Poway that’s in the SDRW is all undeveloped. At fist inspection, this entry in the table seems strange, so it probably deserves a footnote.

KTUA

*Please add an asterisk after Poway in the table and add this footnote-
* Poway’s jurisdictional land area is all undeveloped.*

26] General comment for the entire document – Handle it however you’d like, but I’ve never been comfortable using the preposition “the” before the name of a lake or reservoir. I don’t like “the El Capitan Reservoir” or “the Lake Jennings.” We don’t say or write “the Lake Mead” or “the Lake Michigan” it just doesn’t seem right.

ANCHOR

Modification made.

27] Reference Cathy Cibit’s comment #6 about whether the Barona reservation owns or manages its acreage – As I understand it, the reservation land is owned by the Federal government [Bureau of Indian Affairs], held in trust for the tribal members, and managed by the tribal government. So, it is probably correct to say “The Barona Indian Reservation manages 6,823 acres”

KTUA

Agree with Jeff’s perspective (2nd comment) and feel comfortable leaving the section as is.

28] Table 2-5 doesn’t add up to 100%.

I believe vacant undeveloped has been omitted.

KTUA

The table in the assessment p250 was correct – something got clipped off when it was copied over – please replace.

29] Tables 2-5 and 2-9 list lands uses.

I believe the last category in each table should be “undeveloped **private** land.” This is needed to distinguish this land use category from public preserve lands, which is also undeveloped but a much different land use type.

KTUA

Modification made.

30] Section 2.7.3, approximately page 26.

There doesn’t appear to be an equivalent of Table 2-5 or 2-9 “Land Uses” for the San Diego Mgt Area. Was that table left out accidentally, or is there no good data?

KTUA

Significant rewrite of Section 2.7.3.

31] Section 2.7.

Generally speaking, the figures associated with this section are not referenced in the text. For example, in the portion of the text that address population density there is no mention of Figure 1- 11 “Population Denisty 2000” nor Figure 1-12 “Population Density 2020.”

KTUA

Significant rewrite of Section 2.7.3.

Also, it seems many of the figures in Appendix A are not numbered to correspond with the sections of text that each is best associated with. For example, I would expect the figure titled “Population Denisty 2000” to be numbered 2-x, because population is discussed in section 2.

KTUA

Significant rewrite of Section 2.7.3.

Every figure should be described or referenced somewhere in the text [many are not]. Then, every figure should be numbered to correspond to that text section.

KTUA

Significant rewrite of Section 2.7.3.

32] Section 2.7, pages 23, 25, elsewhere.

The sub-basins [e.g., sub-basin #72240] are used extensively, for example, in the discussions of population and land use conversions. However, the origin of the sub-basin layout is not described anywhere [where’d they come from?], and in the text no figure is referenced to show where they are located.

KTUA

Significant rewrite of Section 2.7.3.

33] Tables 2-8, 2-12, and 2-15 “Land Use Conversions”

These tables aren’t discussed very much in the text, and are not described at all. Where did the data come from? What do the numbers mean? These tables, and the information they contain, deserve a full discussion.

KTUA

Significant rewrite of Section 2.7.3.

34] Figure 1-16 Need to add to the title, something like

“Cedar Fire, October & November 2003
Burn Severity”

KTUA

Revised figure to be provided.

33] Section 3.2, page 30, first paragraph, first sentence.

“From the perspective of drinking source water, the City of San Diego Water Department (SDWD) has concluded that diffuse NPS from residential and commercial developments

ANCHOR

Modification made.

34] Section 3.2, page 30, second paragraph, fourth sentence.

“However, from the perspective of drinking source water, the SDWD has concluded that diffuse NPS from residential and commercial developments

ANCHOR

Modification made.

35] Section 3.2, page 31, second paragraph, first sentence

“..developed to date from the receiving water monitoring program ~~include~~ undertaken by the Padre Dam Municipal ...”

ANCHOR

Modification made.

36] Section 3.3 Groundwater” on pages 32 & 33 and Section 3.4 “Surface Water” on pages 33-35 are duplications of Section 2.4 and Section 2.5.

This information doesn’t need to be in both places.

ANCHOR

Modification made.

Sections 3.3 and 3.4 should discuss the Issues of Concern for surface water as a source of drinking water, as the Watershed Group discussed in meetings in November. I hoping these group discussions have already been incorporated into the next document.

ANCHOR

Comments addressed.

37] Section 3.6.3 Data Management – the first sentence needs to be reworked.

I suggest: “Data management is the active collection, storage, categorization, and analysis of spatial data (e.g., GIS, CAD, maps) and attribute data (e.g., descriptive, numerical) in both electronic and paper formats. Data management is one of the underlying needs in any large-scale watershed management effort.”

KTUA

Comment addressed.

38] Chapter 4, beginning on page 41.

? In each section of chapter 4, the “summary of problem” should be shortened and simplified. It should be a statement of the problem, not a restatement of information presented earlier in the Plan. For the most part, the background information has already been presented. If it hasn’t, then the background info should be put in Chapters 2 or 3.

So, for example, in Section 4.7.1 Summary of Problem [for Data Management], the opening paragraph could be replaced with something like:

“Data management is an underlying requirement of any large-scale watershed management effort. There is currently no comprehensive inventory of data and information for the SDRW. Creating a bibliographic and metadata inventory is a logical early step for managing the SDRW.”

KTUA

Comments noted. Significant revisions to Section 4.7.1.

MERKEL

Revisions made as necessary.

ANCHOR

Comment noted and revised as necessary.

39] Section 4.1.1, page 41, second paragraph, fourth sentence

“Currently, none of **the** entities or management groups ...”

KTUA

Modification made.

39] Section 4.1.1, page 41, second paragraph, last sentence

“Nevertheless, it is essential to **immediately** develop ~~immediately~~ a stable, yet flexible process and ...”

KTUA

Modification made.

40] Section 4.1.2, page 41, first bullet

“The San Diego River Conservancy, San Diego River Coalition, the NPDES Copermittees, **water agencies**, and the participants of the Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP) are all currently...”

KTUA

Modification made.

41] Section 4.1.3, page 42, fourth paragraph

“Develop a management structure and membership **for a watershed working group** that is stable and broad enough to enable ...”

KTUA

Modification made.

42] Section 4.2.1, page 42, last paragraph

“...issues that watersheds face are directly linked to the activities and decisions made by the individuals that live, work, and recreate within ~~their boundaries~~ **the watershed**.”

KTUA

Modification made.

42] Section 4.2.1, page 43, first paragraph

“Unfortunately, most individuals do not ~~cannot define a watershed much less~~ understand the compounding effect of ~~their~~ individual actions on the health and function of their watershed. **Indeed, many people do not even understand what a watershed is.**”

[There’s nothing wrong with ending a sentence with a verb.]

KTUA

Modification made.

43] Section 4.4 Groundwater Management

This section is too long. Redundancies within the section need to be eliminated, and information that is discussed elsewhere in the Plan need to be left out of this section. The section needs to focus on recommended actions for groundwater. The section needs to have the same “look and feel” as the other parts of Chapter 4. There is too much detail in the recommended actions [or, alternatively, too little detail in the other parts of Chapter 4.]

When all boiled down, the short-term recommended actions for groundwater management is to gather more information and data, and the long-term recommended actions are to review and strengthen existing regulations. All the rest of what is written in this section is details around those actions.

WELCH

Edits made to referenced text.

44] Section 5.2, page 58, second paragraph.

I recommend putting the definitions for “E1,” “E2,” “L1,” and “L2” into a bulleted list.

ANCHOR

Significant rewrite of Table 5-1 and supporting text.

45] Throughout Section 5 and especially Table 5-1 “Implementation Schedule”

I recommend giving each action item a unique identifier. For example, the Education and Outreach action items could be E&O1, E&O2,; the Hydromodification action items could be H1, H2,....., etc. This will allow the reader to cross reference from the text to Table 5-1, and will allow subsequent users of the Plan to quickly reference an action item.

ANCHOR

Modification made.

46] Section 5.3, pages 63 - 65.

This is a well-written and pertinent suite of paragraphs. However, it seems somewhat out of place. In its current location [near the end of Chapter 5], it seems like something of an afterthought. Perhaps it would be better near the beginning of Chapter 5. Alternatively, because these paragraphs address a basic principal of how actions should be prioritized, maybe they should be in Section 1.2.

ANCHOR

Agreed. Moved to Section 1.

47] Section 5.4, pages 65 & 66.

There is text missing in the transition from page 65 to page 66.

ANCHOR

Comment addressed.

48] Disclaimer on the bottom of page 66 –

“Funding for this project has been provided in full or in part” Which is it? We know, of course, that Prop 13 provided only part of the funding, so how about changing the disclaimer to

Funding for this project has been provided ~~in full or~~ in part through a contract with

COUNTY

This language is required by the grant received from the SDRWQCB, Prop 13, for the preparation of this WMP.

FROM: HAROLD BAILEY, PADRE DAM MWD

1. Table 2-3. Include the name of the location of the data in the title for the table.

EVEREST

Agreed. Replacing Table 2-3 with the following table.

Table 2-3
Monthly Mean Flow Rates at the USGS Fashion Valley Station

FLOW (CFS)¹	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
<i>Mean</i>	98.2	119.0	141.0	47.7	17.4	6.9	3.0	2.4	3.3	6.5	26.4	41.0
<i>Maximum</i>	683.0	668.0	777.0	242.0	135.0	21.3	8.9	9.5	20.0	31.2	144.0	143.0
<i>Minimum</i>	6.5	20.5	8.4	7.7	2.5	1.3	0.3	0.5	0.0	0.6	0.9	5.1

¹ Cubic feet per second.

2. Page 11, San Diego Management Area. Some surface water is a result of leakage under the dams and contributes to flows. This is of most significance during summer months.

WELCH

Modification made.

3. Page 30. The correct spelling is “Forrester Creek”

ANCHOR

There is ample public record for both spellings. Forrester was changed to Forester at the request of stakeholders reviewing the draft Assessment and will remain as Forester for convenience and consistency.

4. Page 31. Ditto. (there may be other locations in the document that need the same correction.)

ANCHOR

See response above.

5. Page 33. Water Quality in San Diego Area. There is a plume of MTBE in the Lakeside-Riverview area that is causing Riverview WD to treat for use as potable water. Both Lakeside and Riverview should have some good data on ground water quality because they are using it as a source for potable water.

WELCH

Comment addressed.

6. Table 5-1. General comment. Many plans include a listing of success factors or success criteria which provide benchmarks or standards by which success can be measured. I suggest that an additional column be provided to include, for at least some of the actions, some high level success factor. For example, the very first item addresses identifying stakeholders and setting up a committee structure. Success criteria would be 1) a complete list of stakeholders, and 2) a formalized committee structure. Similar criteria can be established for each action item.

ANCHOR

The Study Team, with consensus of the WWG, has created a matrix for projects to be used in the future (Table 5-2).

- 7. Table 5-1. It would help to number the action items in some manner. Probably the best way is by section, such as IC-1 for Interagency Cooperation, EO-1 for Education and Outreach, etc.

ANCHOR

Table and text have been modified to include identification of action items.

FROM CHIARA CLEMENTE, SDRWQCB

Mike Porter had a chance to go over the implementation schedule, and I am carrying forward some of his comments/concerns....

Similar to the workshop presentation, he wanted to reiterate that hydromodification is not the same issue as impervious surfaces. A hydromod. is the morphologic modification of a water body (e.g. culverts, crossings, bridges, dams, channelization, dredging, narrowing, boxing, etc.) Cataloguing and reducing the amount of impervious surfaces is also important, but it is not the same thing as minimizing hydromods. We suggest separate action groups for the two. Mike had a few more task-specific comments, but I can probably just mention those at the next Watershed Group meeting.

KTUA

Modification made. These issues are now in separate sections.

Page 23- Turn should be Tern

ANCHOR

Modification made.

Page 26- we may want to expand a bit about the SDRC and other major players, and how their scopes are limited.

KTUA

Modification made.

Overall, why no maps and figures?

ANCHOR

Comment addressed above.

Page 35, SDRWQCB is not the only one with the power and responsibility to prohibit and restrict hydromodifications. What about the County and Cities?

EVEREST

Replace the third paragraph in Section 4.3.1 on Page 29 with the following paragraph.

The results of the assessment indicated that although most hydromodification has been limited primarily to the San Diego Management Area, hydromodification is occurring in the other two management areas as documented by recent permit activity processed by the SDRWQCB. This indicates that future hydromodification of the watershed may continue unless guidelines or policy changes are adopted to give the SDRWQCB and other regulatory agencies (e.g., San Diego County

and watershed cities) the ability to prohibit or restrict these activities in the future (e.g., channelization). However, there are very limited data (e.g., maps or reports) indicating the type, extent, and location of hydromodifications throughout the watershed. These data are needed to analyze the impacts of existing hydromodifications on the health of the watershed and to estimate the impacts of future hydromodifications.

page 37- Reference to MEC study w/regards to localized sources. This is a controversial conclusion (subject to debate). I suggest removing that sentence entirely.

ANCHOR

This information is taken from the monitoring results collected pursuant to the Municipal Permit.

Ch. 3 contains redundant background information that is already mentioned (and should be) in Chapter 2. Remove the redundancy and provide more detail on the issues of concern.

ANCHOR

Comment noted.

Chapter 4- it appears that the underlying theme here is hurdles and handicaps, rather than actions or recommendations. Can we add a little more recommended actions to shift the focus to explain how to overcome these hurdles and handicaps?

ANCHOR

Comment noted.

4.1.1 "None of the entities have the responsibility or authority..." sounds pretty grim and somewhat mislrsding. Could we shower some optimism in there and say that, collectively, the appropriate entities and authorities can make some positive changes?

KTUA

Comment addressed.

4.1.2 Again, rather than focusing on why it's too hard to mobilize a group, the chapter should discuss what it takes to do so.

KTUA

Comment addressed.

4.1.4 Need more specific recommendation(s).

KTUA

Comment addressed.

Section 4.3- I think this still does not reflect Mike Porter's point...Hydromods are no the same as increases in impervious surfaces. You can still make hydromods without increasing impervious surfaces, and you can decrease impervious surfaces while still having problems due to hydromods (eg. channelization with or without concrete). Therefore, I don't think that the impervious surface criteria is an appropriate action recommendation to solve this problem.

KTUA

Comment addressed.

4.3.3 Add...whenever possible remove concrete and RESTORE STREAMS to their natural width and function.

KTUA

Comment addressed.

Page 63 to 64. Last sentence on p.63 is not complete.

ANCHOR

Comment addressed.

Page 66 top row- I think the "?" should be a ",,"?

ANCHOR

Comment noted. This is string of questions.

FROM: DEBORAH JAYNE, SAN DIEGO RIVER CONSERVANCY

Define Watershed Planning

The vision statement and set of principles are good, but I recommend that you also define what “watershed planning” means and why you are doing it. You may wish to consider the following definition:

Watershed planning is intrinsically linked to land use planning. Watershed planning can be defined as the development and implementation of land use policies, programs, and practices designed to protect all of the land, water, and biological resources and associated beneficial uses in an entire watershed from anthropogenic activities. Land use policies/decisions govern human activities on the lands within the watershed. The human activities in turn directly impact the water resources within the watershed. The quality and quantity of land and water resources determine which biological communities and other beneficial uses of the land and water will be supported and to what extent.

ANCHOR

Comment addressed. Change to text to describe purpose of plan.

The land use policies, programs, and practices within a Watershed Plan should seek to address all of the important anthropogenic issues within the watershed including aquatic and terrestrial habitats and ecosystems, water quality, water supply, flood protection, urban development, transportation, housing, recreation, economic development, wetlands, etc. The watershed should be evaluated as a whole and the issues should be looked at simultaneously and in a holistic fashion. If issues are looked at individually and one at a time, it is easy to lose sight of important “cumulative impacts” and risk inadvertently solving one problem only to create another. The watershed planning process should examine the relationships, consequences, connectivities, cumulative impacts, and opportunities associated with these issues.

ANCHOR

Comment addressed. Change to text to discuss relationships between actions.

Take Responsibility for Consequences of Land Use Policies / Recommend Changes to the General Plan

The Watershed Plan should assess and take responsibility for the cumulative long-term consequences of past land use policies and practices on the land, water, and biological resources within the watershed. After recognizing past successes and mistakes, the plan should recommend appropriate changes. Watershed planning should identify what we have done well and what we done poorly. What should we be doing and where should we be doing it? Where and how should we build? What should we not be doing? Where should we not build? What values and functions did the watershed have that have been lost? Be specific and cite examples of problems and opportunities.

Watershed planning is not worth doing if it doesn't make a difference. The Watershed Plan must recognize problems resulting from past land use policies and practices and recommend changes to address those problems. In other words **the General Plan should not be seen as "sacred and untouchable"**. It should be seen as dynamic document that can and should be changed to reflect lessons learned and increased understanding of processes and consequences. Land use practices which have resulted in the degradation of the watershed resources should be abandoned and replaced with new ones that will restore and protect the watershed.

ANCHOR

Comment noted. This plan is not a policy document. Text modified to explain what this plan is intended to do and what it cannot do.

Adopt Land Use Policies that Protect Watershed Resources

Modify the General Plan to include land use policies and practices that protect the land, water, and biological resources of watersheds. For example,

- Prevent future development in the flood plain.
- Prevent filling in or otherwise degrading wetlands and riparian habitats (preserve and where possible, create or restore wetlands and riparian corridors).
- Prevent further physical modifications to the river (channelize, dam). Restore natural flow regime where possible.
- Protect and restore natural watershed functions
- Require minimum buffer zones, setbacks, slope development restrictions, fewer parking spaces, and clustering (compact development) to protect habitat.
- Minimize future hardscaping. Replace existing hardscape where feasible.
- Modify project approval processes. Include conditions of approval in development permits that protect watershed resources. Revise environmental review processes.
- Avoid conversion of areas particularly susceptible to erosion and sediment loss (e.g., steep slopes, highly erodible soils) or establish development guidelines to protect sensitive areas).
- Require pollution prevention and source control best management practices in addition to treatment (structural) best management practices to reduce pollutant loading from land uses to receiving waters.

ANCHOR

Comment noted. This plan is not binding on any jurisdiction or adopted plan. Text modified to include above as recommendations rather than modification to the General Plan.

Incorporate Protective Land Use Policies into Early and Long-term Recommendations

Consider replacing, or augmenting, existing lists of recommended actions throughout Plan with items from the list of policy statements above.

Comment noted.

Review SANDAG’s Regional Growth Management Strategy Recommendations

Review SANDAG’s Regional Growth Management Strategy, Water Quality Element dated November 1997 containing recommendations on urban development and water quality protection. Consider incorporation into Watershed Management Plan.

ANCHOR

Reference to SANDAG’s Water Quality Element and its recommendations will be added to text.

Inclusion of recommendations will be made as appropriate.

Exercise Municipal Authorities and Powers

As the primary land use authorities, municipalities have significant power to effect change. We recommend that you use this authority to adopt and enforce land use policies and practices that protect watershed resources over the long-term. As written, the Plan appears to avoid acknowledging certain existing municipal authorities. For example although the municipalities have the authority to prevent future hydromodifications within their jurisdictions, the Watershed Management Plan indicates that “future hydromodification of the watershed may continue unless guidelines or policy changes are adopted to give the SDRWQCB the ability to prohibit or restrict these activities in the future.” (page 29, 3rd paragraph).

ANCHOR

See comment above relative to ability of WMP to affect land use plans.

On page 41 it states “currently, none of the entities or management groups existing within the SDRW has the responsibility or authority to spend resources in such a broad, watershed-based coalition, one that may require them to deviate from their existing land use plans.” It should be noted that the San Diego MS4 Permit requires municipalities to have a mechanism to conduct land use planning on a watershed basis with neighboring jurisdictions.

KTUA

Comment addressed.

Under Groundwater Management Recommended Action (2nd E1 on page 61), continued regulation and oversight of septic tank waste discharges by the Regional Board. The municipalities can and should participate in this regulation and oversight.

Under Groundwater Management Recommended Action (5th E1 on page 61), continued oversight and regulation of urban runoff by the Regional Board. This responsibility is shared between the municipalities and the Regional Board. The Regional Board must enforce its NPDES permits (MS4, industrial and construction permits) which serve as its legal authority. In addition the municipalities must also enforce their complementary storm water ordinances, which serve as their legal authority.

WELCH

Comment addressed.

Implement Public Workshop Recommendations

Page 3 of the Plan documents the highest priority watershed planning needs and expectations identified during the public workshops and their relative rankings. Many of these concepts are excellent and should be pursued (e.g., reduce or eliminate development in the flood plain, limit growth to protect water and habitat quality; establish buffer zones, encourage water conservation, acquire land to create wetlands, etc.). Yet it appears that many of these recommendations are either not discussed or not emphasized in the balance of the Plan.

ANCHOR

See comment above relative to ability of WMP to affect land use plans.

Most Significant Threats to Watershed (page 6, top pf page)

I would recommend characterizing the River's major threats/problems as related to either (1) urban development; or (2) hydromodification, both of which have several characteristic components. Urban development is associated with the conversion of natural pervious ground surfaces to hardscape and an increase in population and commensurate increase in pollutant sources. This conversion and population increase translate to an increase in the volume and velocity of runoff and an increase in pollutant sources and loading.

Hydromodification should be defined as physical changes to the River itself such as channelization (straightening and confining flow), installation of dams, and streambank and shoreline erosion.

ANCHOR

Comment addressed.

Invasive Exotic Species

Page 64 states that the ubiquitous presence of exotic species has been the greatest single factor resulting in habitat degradation. The text needs to point out that the presence of exotic species is not a random occurrence for which no one need take responsibility. Instead it should be noted that invasive exotics are present due to anthropogenic conditions. The invader's seeds are typically initially introduced by humans (often times by the improper disposal of landscape wastes). They colonize quickly. Hydromodification (physical alterations to the River) and urban development stress the native species and provide additional habitat for invaders. Over time the invaders become well established and displace the natives.

MERKEL

Comment addressed.

Emphasize What "Can" be Done Instead of What "Cannot"

The Plan, especially Recommendations Section 4, seems to have somewhat of a negative tone and focuses on the limitations and impediments to action and change, rather than on what actions can be taken and how can hurdles be overcome. I recommend shifting the focus from what can't be done to what can be done to protect watersheds.

ANCHOR

Comment noted.

Hydromodification is Distinct from Urban Development

Page 44 Section 4.3. Although your broad definition of hydromodification is not incorrect, I think it is helpful to view hydromodification and urban development as separate problems. Be sure to define both terms and list the components of each. Keeping them distinct is important to ensure that appropriate and separate solutions/recommendations are developed for each. The recommendations 4.3.3. and 4.3.4 (regarding impervious surfaces) are not appropriate solutions for hydromodification. Limiting hydromodification is the best solution for hydromodification. Limiting impervious surfaces is one solution for urban development. This section should be broken into two separate sections on water quality (hydromodification and urban development).

KTUA

Comment addressed.

Repetitious Text

The Plan seems to contain a lot of repetitious text which should be eliminated and replaced with a more comprehensive discussion of the issues (e.g., section 3).

ANCHOR

Comment noted.

Include Description of Statewide Ambient Monitoring Programs, SWAMP and GAMA

Describe statewide surface water and groundwater ambient monitoring programs with standard QA/QC protocols and data repository. Pg 47

ANCHOR

Comment noted. These have been described in the Assessment. Text will be modified to include reference to Assessment.

Include a Glossary

For clarity, all important terms, concepts, and regulatory permits and programs, etc. should be defined (e.g., watershed, hydromodification, MS4 permit, beneficial uses, water quality objectives, standards, Total Maximum Daily Load calculation, section 401 certification, Clean Water Act Section 303(d), applied water. What is the purpose of and distinction between WURMPs and JURMPs?

ANCHOR

Comment noted. These have been described in the Assessment and are described in the WMP.

Page 4 section 1.2.1 (Regulations and Regulatory Reports)

You may want to cite the MS4 permit and its purpose.

ANCHOR

Comment noted. While, this has been described in the Assessment, text will be modified to include description of the MS4 permit.

Page 7 table 2-1

Provide in acres and miles.

EVEREST

Modification made.

Page 9 second paragraph

I recommend that the text list the Section 303(d) pollutants and the Monitoring List pollutants for entire watershed here. Can they also be added to the Figure 1-4?

ANCHOR

Figure will not be modified, however entire list of pollutants is added to the text.

Page 10

List Section 303(d) and Monitoring List pollutants for San Diego Management Area.

ANCHOR

Comment addressed.

Page 6, bottom of page

Add: River flows year round due to dry weather urban runoff flows and groundwater.

ANCHOR

Comment noted. Flow rates, by month, are shown on Table 2-3.

Page 18 (bottom of page) and Page 19

What is “municipal permit”? What is its purpose? What does it regulate? Rewrite middle paragraph on WURMPs and JURMPs and SUSMPs. I’ll be happy to assist.

ANCHOR

These are discussed in Assessment; text provided by stakeholder will be included.

Page 20 bottom of page

Provide citation for three categories of impervious cover report. Define sensitive, impacted and non-supporting.

KTUA

See response provided to J. Pasek’s comment above.

Page 22-27

Check for accuracy and explain calculations. Is El Capitan Population 17,762 and Area 120,753? Density equals 1 person/acre? Page 15. Explain your comment about population over-emphasized and amount of land inflated. Add grand total acres to all impervious surfaces tables.

KTUA

Calculation correct. Other comments addressed.

Page 31. MEC Report Conclusion

I have some concerns about this conclusion. The Lower portion of River is Section 303(d) listed for bacteria, so the River mouth likely contributes to Ocean Beach water quality.

ANCHOR

This conclusion came from the Annual Report.

Page 32-35

Delete redundant text.

WELCH

Comment addressed.

Page 38-39

Include public access to data.

KTUA

Comment addressed.

MSCP Working

Pg 51 top paragraph. I don't think it is correct to state that MSCP, *by all accounts*, appears to be working to acquire and protect habitat. I'm not sure this conclusion has been categorically accepted by all. In any event, Municipalities should consider acquisitions.

SD COUNTY

The Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) is the most ambitious habitat conservation plan ever undertaken in the United States. This 172,000-acre regional plan designates 98,379 acres within the County of San Diego South County MSCP Preserve to protect threatened plant and animal species but also balances preservation imperatives with our commitment to housing and economic development needs.

Under the MSCP, local jurisdictions work together to preserve open space in specific areas, thereby ensuring the protection of sensitive plant and animal species. This eliminates the need to list the species as endangered under federal and State Endangered Species Acts and reduces the costly permit process for private landowners and public agencies. Ultimately, the MSCP provides for a large, connected habitat area, creating a more effective preserve system with better protection for the rare, threatened, and endangered species in the coastal region.

At the inception of the MSCP in 1998, the County already had 57,080 acres preserved. As of December 31, 2004, a total of 34,012 acres of land have been preserved or committed within the County's portion of the MSCP, contributing to a total of 91,092 acres (or 93% of the Preserve). As of December 31, 2004, the City of San Diego has conserved 32,528 acres.

Where is page 56? –

ANCHOR

Comment addressed.

Page 64 top --

Eliminate duplicate text.

ANCHOR

Comment addressed.

Page 66 top --

Restore missing text.

ANCHOR

Comment addressed.

COMMENTS ON DRAFT PLAN FROM BARONA BAND OF MISSION INDIANS

The Tribe requests that the following changes be made to the draft Plan. New language is in italics, deleted language is in brackets and underlined.

First, make the relevant portion of Section 2.5 on page 13 read as follows:

San Vicente Management Area. Groundwater provides the exclusive source of water supply for the developed areas of the San Vicente Management Area (except for the northern portion of the area which is served by the Ramona Municipal Water District). Groundwater also serves as the primary source of supply within the Barona *sub-basin* [Valley]. Over the past several years *some* private well owners have been experiencing declining water levels. [Both on- and off-Reservation development of the area and the recent drought conditions have likely contributed to these water level declines.]

ANCHOR

Replace “Valley” with “sub-basin.” Delete sentence as requested. The above paragraph has been replaced with the following:

Groundwater provides the exclusive source of water supply for the developed areas of the San Vicente Management Area (except for the northern portion of the area which is served by the Ramona Municipal Water District). Groundwater also serves as the primary source of supply within the Barona sub-basin. Over the past several years, some private well owners within the Barona sub-basin have experienced declining water levels in their wells. As a result, the Barona Indian Reservation and some local well owners have had to truck in water to supplement locally available supplies. Additionally, the Barona Indian Reservation is negotiating with the City of San Diego for imported water supply via San Vicente Reservoir.

Groundwater also serves as the primary source of supply within the Barona *sub-basin* [Valley]. Over the past several years private well owners *in a micro-basin adjacent to the Barona sub-basin [in the vicinity of the Barona Indian Reservation]* have experienced declining water levels. [Both on- and off-reservation development of the area and the recent drought conditions have likely contributed to these water level declines]. *Widespread drought conditions and clustering of many small and inefficient wells have contributed to such declines. As a result, during dry periods water is currently being trucked by many local owners [on-site, and] The Tribe is negotiating with the City of San Diego [for water supply from San Vicente Reservoir.] to store imported water in the San Vicente Reservoir to be piped to the Barona Indian Reservation for in lieu recharge and fire protection. It is not known if the owners of the cluster of private wells in the adjacent micro-basin are taking any steps to improve their wells.*

ANCHOR

The paragraph as shown above is no longer in the WMP

Second, make essentially the same changes to Section 3.4 on page 34.

ANCHOR

Section 3.4 no longer contains this language..

Third, the first sentence in Section 3.2 on page 30 should be revised to read:

San Vicente Management Area. In this management area, nitrate has been shown to be a COC in dry weather monitoring results. [and eutrophic conditions are a potential concern in Padre Barona Creek.]

ANCHOR

Leave original text. At the end of the sentence, add: (State Monitoring List 2002; http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/tmdl/docs/draft_2002_mon_list_011303.pdf).

Fourth, make the introductory paragraph of the recommendations of Section 4.4.3 on page 49 read:

El Capitan, San Vicente, and San Diego Management Areas. A centralized, coordinated groundwater data collection effort is recommended to allow for more complete characterization of groundwater availability and quality within the El Capitan, San Vicente, and San Diego Management Areas. Such a centralized, coordinated groundwater data collection effort should include , *for all areas under the regulatory jurisdiction of the CSD:*

ANCHOR

Comment noted and no change made to text. Any data collected anywhere by anyone within the basin is of use in addressing watershed issues.

APPENDIX D

GRANT LIST

This page left intentionally blank

STATE

Cal EPA

- Environmental Enforcement and Training Grants
- Environmental Justice Small Grants Program

Cal FED

- Water Use Efficiency Grant Program: Part A - Urban Water Conservation Grant

CDF

- Tree Planting and Maintenance Grants (Prop 12)

California Integrated Waste Management Board

- Facility Compliance Loans
- Farm and Ranch Cleanup Grants
- Household Hazardous Waste Grants
- Recycling Market Development Zone (RMDZ) Loans
- Reuse Assistance Grants
- Solid Waste Disposal and Codisposal Site Cleanup Program
- Solid Waste Disposal and Site Cleanup Grants
- Sustainable Building Grants
- Unified Education Strategy Grants
- Used Oil Grants

Coastal Conservancy

- Wetlands Recovery Project Small Grants Program
- Whale Tail Grants

Boating & Waterways

- Beach Erosion Control Grant Program
- Coastal Beach Erosion Control Grant Program
- Vessel Pumpout Grant Program

Fish & Game Land Acquisition Program

- Natural Communities Conservation Planning (NCCP) Program
- NCCP Local Assistance Program
- Oak Woodlands Conservation Program
- Public Access Program
- Rangeland, Grazing Land and Grasslands Protection Program

Dept of Conservation Agricultural and Grazing Land Preservation (Prop 40)
California Farmland Conservancy Program
Watershed Coordinator Grants

State Parks

California Youth Soccer and Recreation Development Program (Prop 12 & 40)
Habitat Conservation Fund
Land & Water Conservation Fund
Murray-Hayden Program (Prop 12 & 40)
Per Capita Program (Prop 12 & 40)
Recreational Trails Program
Roberti-Z'berg Programs – Block Grants & Competitive Grants (Prop 12 & 40)
State Urban Parks & Healthy Communities Grant Program (Prop 12 & 40)

Dept of Water Resources Flood Control Subventions Program

Integrated Regional Water Management Grant (Prop 50)

GO SERV

AmeriCorps Program
Community Conservation Corps Funding Program
Resources Agency Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program (EEMP)

State Water Resources Control Board Citizen Monitoring and Related Water Quality Program Funding

Clean Beaches Initiative Projects (Prop 13)
Clean Water State Revolving Fund (Prop 13)
Coastal Nonpoint Source Program (Prop 13)
Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) grant program (Prop 50)
Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program (Prop 13)
Pesticide Research and Investigation of Source, and Mitigation (PRISM) Grant Program (Prop 13)
Seawater Intrusion Control Loan Program
Small Communities Grant Program (Prop 13)
Small Community Wastewater Grant (SCWG) Program
Wastewater Treatment Facilities
Water Recycling Financial Assistance Program (Prop 13)
Water Recycling Funding Program (Prop 204)
Watershed Protection Program (Prop 13 & 40)

Wildlife Conservation Board

California Riparian Habitat Conservation Program
Habitat Enhancement and Restoration Program
Inland Wetlands Conservation Program
Natural Heritage Preservation Tax Credit Program

FEDERAL

Department of Defense

Flood Control Projects

Department of Energy

GeoPowering the West: Geothermal Outreach

Million Solar Roof Initiative Small Grant Program

Research and Development Support (RDS) Services

Solid State Energy Conversion Alliance (SECA) Core Technology Program

Department of Interior

"Water 2025: Preventing Crises and Conflict in the West" program

State and Tribal Wildlife Grants Program

Department of Transportation

Environmental Research Program

US EPA

Assessment and Watershed Protection Program Grants

Broadcast Meteorologists to Convey Watershed Information

Collaborative Science & Technology Network for Sustainability

Ecology and Oceanography of Harmful Algal Blooms Grant

Environmental Education Grants Program

Environmental Education Grants Program

Environmental Information Exchange Network Grant Program

Environmental Justice Community Interns Available in 2004

Environmental Justice Small Grants Program

Five Star Restoration Challenge Grants

Innovation Work Group Pilots

Integrated Pest Management and Sustainable Agriculture Projects

NPS Water Pollution Control (319h)

P2 Funding for Small Businesses

P3: People, Prosperity, and the Planet

Pesticide Environmental Stewardship Program (PESP)

Pollution Prevention Grants

Pollution Prevention Small Grant Program

Resource Conservation Fund

Small Business Innovation and Research (SBIR) grant

Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) for waste minimization

Source Reduction Assistance Program

State Innovation Grant Program

State Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting Program (Water Quality Assessment of Wadeable Rivers and Streams)

State Monitoring, Assessment, and Reporting Program Grants and Cooperative Agreements
State Revolving Fund (SRF) and Wetlands

Targeted Watershed Grants

US/Mexico Border 2012 Program

Water Quality Cooperative Agreements under CWA 104(b)(3)

Watershed Initiative Grants

Wetlands Program Development Grants

Economic Research Service

Program of Research on the Economics of Invasive Species Management (PREISM)

FEMA

Flood Mitigation Assistance Program

Hazard Mitigation Grant Program

Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program

Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program - National Flood Insurance Program

Public Assistance Program

Fish & Wildlife Services

Coastal Program: Partnering for Coastal Conservation

Coastal Program: Technical and Financial Assistance

Coastal Wetlands

Endangered Species Conservation Program, Traditional Conservation Grants

Endangered Species Grants to States, Territories and Private Landowners

Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration

Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration

Fish Passage Program

North American Wetlands Conservation Act Grants Program

Partners of Fish and Wildlife Program

Partnerships for Wildlife

Private Stewardship Grants Program

Small Grants Program

NOAA

Community-Based Restoration Program grant

Oceans and Human Health Initiative

National Parks Service

American Battlefield Protection Program

Federal Lands to Parks

National Trails System

Preservation Technology and Training Grants

Rivers and Trails Program

Save America's Treasures grant

Natural Resources Conservation Service

Conservation Innovation Grants
Conservation Technical Assistance Program
Emergency Watershed Protection (EWP) Program
Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP) (California)
Environmental Quality Incentives Program (National)
Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program
Renewables Production and R&D
Resource Conservation and Development (RC&D)
Wetlands Reserve Program

FOUNDATIONS

AARP Andrus Foundation Grants
Alfred P Sloan Foundation
Allstate Foundation
American Express Foundation
American Rivers-NOAA Community-based Restoration Program Partnership
American Sportfishing Association: Community-Based Habitat Restoration Projects
Bank of America
Barbara Bush Foundation
Busch Entertainment Corporation Conservation Fund
California Wildlands Grassroots Fund
Captain Planet Foundation: Kids Environmental Grants
Center for Invasive Plant Management Grants
Citizens' Monitoring and Technical Assessment Fund
Corning Foundation
ExxonMobil Foundation
Ezra Jack Keats Foundation (Minigrants to Libraries)
Ford Foundation (Ed, Media, Arts, Culture)
Ford Motor Company Fund (Environment Program)
Hasbro Children's Foundation
Heritage Preservation - Conservation Assessment Program (CAP)
Hewlett Foundation (Ed Program)
HSBC Bank Foundation
IBM Community Relations Grants
JC Downing Foundation
Kellogg Foundation (food systems)
Kirsch Foundation Environmental Grants

Kodak American Greenways Grants
Kresge Foundation (Science Initiative)
MacArthur Foundation (Media & Radio)
Melinda Gray Ardia Environmental Foundation
Mellon Foundation (Conservation and the Environment Program)
Mervyn's Arts and Education grants
Migratory Bird Conservancy
Milken Family Foundation
National Fish & Wildlife Foundation: Matching Grants for Conservation on Private Lands
National Fish & Wildlife Foundation: Migratory Bird Conservation Program
National Fish & Wildlife Foundation: Native Plant Conservation Initiative (NPCI)
National Fish & Wildlife Foundation: Nature of Learning Grants Program
National Forest Foundation: Matching Awards Program
National Geographic Society: Conservation Trust
National Geographic Society Grants for Scientific Field Research
National Tree Trust: Community Tree Planting Program
Nature of Learning Grants Program
NEH TV Projects
Patagonia Foundation Grants
Pew Charitable Trusts
Resources Legacy Fund Programs
RGK Foundation
Rockefeller Grants (Creativity and Culture)
San Diego County Fish and Wildlife Advisory Commission
San Diego Foundation: Environmental Grants
Sea World/Busch Gardens/Fuji Film Excellence Awards
Starr Foundation
StEPP Foundation
Surdna Foundation
Target Community Giving Grants
The Conservation Fund
The Ludwick Family Foundation
The Resource Conservation Fund
Tom's of Maine Giving for Goodness Program
Toyota TAPESTRY Grant Program
Wal-Mart Foundation
Wildlife Forever Foundation