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Ramona Pipeline Background

1977  Established treated water connection to Ramona from Poway WTP

1986  Water Authority studies replacement of treated water supply to Ramona - Poway WTP nearing capacity

1987  Ramona requests new pipeline

1988  Agreements with Ramona, Olivenhain, City of San Diego for increased capacity and new service connections

1990  Ramona Pipeline placed in service
Ramona Pipeline Construction - Rancho Bernardo Rd
Poway Service Connection Planning Study

- Poway Request - 20 to 24 cfs
- Planning Study Framework
  - Ramona Pipeline agreements and capacity evaluation
  - Alternatives identification workshop
  - Alternatives analysis and identification of preferred connection
  - Completion of Planning Study required by April 2021 (Division of Drinking Water)
Authorize City of Poway’s (Poway) request for a new service connection on the Water Authority’s system to be owned and operated by the Water Authority for the purpose of conveying treated water into Poway’s distribution system.
Authorize the City of Poway’s request for a planning study for a new service connection on the Water Authority’s system to be owned and operated by the Water authority for the purpose of conveying treated water into Poway’s distribution system. The planning study will include the original stakeholders of the Ramona Pipeline including the City of San Diego, Olivenhain Municipal Water District and Ramona Municipal Water District. The connection point will be determined for Board approval at a later date and will involve the original stakeholders that funded the Ramona Pipeline.
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Background on Proposition 16

- Placed on ballot through legislative action - ACA 5 by Assemblymember Shirley Weber
  - Assemblymember Gonzalez - Joint author
  - Senator Ben Hueso - Co-author

San Diego Legislative Delegation Votes on ACA 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSEMBLY</th>
<th>SENATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boerner-Horvath Gloria Gonzalez Maienschein Weber</td>
<td>Atkins Hueso Bates Jones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prop. 16 would repeal the provisions of Proposition 209 from the California Constitution

Prop. 209 was approved by California voters in 1996 and effectively prohibited the implementation and use of affirmative action or other practices that provided preferential treatment to any individual or group on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin by state and public agencies.

Prop. 16 would repeal Prop. 209, but would NOT require or compel government entities to develop and implement policies or programs that would consider race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin in the operation of public employment, education, or contracting.

If approved by voters, key questions will relate to the permissibility of post-Prop. 16 policies and programs under today’s law.

- Legal questions remain related to “plus-factor” vs. “quotas” or “broadly tailored policies”
Support for Proposition 16

- Supporters of Prop. 16 contend that the effects of implementing Proposition 209’s prohibitions have not ensured fairness, diversity, and equity in education, public contracting, and public employment.

- Notable supporters include:
  - Governor Gavin Newsom
  - Dozens of elected officials from throughout the state
  - Many San Diego-based local elected officials
  - CA State Association of Counties
  - Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
  - California Labor Federation
  - California Teachers Association
  - Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce
  - Environmental Defense Fund
Opposition to Proposition 16

- Opponents of Prop. 16 contend that the repeal of Prop. 209 would reintroduce racial preferences in California in violation of law and court decisions and would create division among race and ethnic groups.

- Notable opponents include:
  - Several elected officials from throughout the state
  - American Civil Rights Institute
  - Students for Fair Admissions
  - American Freedom Alliance
  - Chinese American Civic Action Alliance
  - Ward Connerly
Staff Recommendation

- Adopt the resolution endorsing Proposition 16, the “Allows Diversity as a Factor in Public Employment, Education, and Contracting Decisions” legislative constitutional amendment