

AGENDA
Borrego Water District Board of Directors
Regular Meeting
December 14, 2011, 9:00 a.m.
806 Palm Canyon Drive
Borrego Springs, CA 92004

I. OPENING PROCEDURES

- A. Call to Order
- B. Pledge of Allegiance
- C. Roll Call
- D. Approval of Agenda
- E. Approval of Minutes
 - Special meeting of November 1, 2011 (page 3)
 - Regular meeting of November 16, 2011 (page 4-6)
- F. Comments from Directors and Requests for Future Agenda Items
- G. Comments from the Public and Requests for Future Agenda Items (comments will be limited to 3 minutes)
- H. Correspondence:
 - Letter from JPIA (page7)
- I. Staff Reports:
 - A. Financial Reports – November 2011
 - B. Manager / Operations Report (page 8-26)
- J. Attorney's Report

II. CURRENT BUSINESS MATTERS

- A. Solar Power Purchase Agreement presentation by Steven McQuerry of Solar City
- B. Proposal from Lane Sharman for solar site investigation in the amount not to exceed \$12,000
- C. Discussion and possible approval of Joint Funding Agreement. Amendment number 4 with U.S. Geological Survey (page 27-31)
- D. Discussion and possible approval for the Due Diligence Committee to research the cost/benefits of Automated Meter Reading (AMR), and accounting and billing software upgrade. (page 32)
- E. Discussion and possible approval to extend Audit Committee work to prepare for FY 2012 audit and improved financial reporting format. (page 32)
- F. Discussion and possible approval for the General Manager to present a report on possible emergency funding mechanisms at the February Board workshop. (page 32)
- G. Discussion and possible action on upcoming grant funding opportunities with Bureau of Reclamation and Department of Water Resources local groundwater systems. (page 33-34)
- H. Discussion of moving the Special meeting (workshop) from Tuesdays to Wednesday.

III. COMMITTEE REPORTS & PROPOSALS

Ad Hoc Committees

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. Audit Committee | (M. Brecht, L. Brecht) |
| 2. Due-Diligence | (M. Brecht, L. Brecht) |
| 3. Strategic Planning Committee/IRWM | (Hart, L. Brecht) (page 35-45) |
| 4. Executive Committee | (Estep, Hart) |
| 5. Operations & Management Committee | (M. Brecht, Hart) |
| 6. Asset Ad Hoc Committee | (Hart, M. Brecht) |
| 7. Christmas Circle Committee | (Estep, Hart) |
| 8. Negotiating (Montesoro) | (Estep, M. Brecht) |

IV. STAFF REPORTS

- A. Water and Wastewater Operations Report – November 2011 (page 47)
- B. Water Production/Use Records – November 2011 (page 48-51)

V. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. BWD Holidays for 2012 (page 53)

VI. CLOSED SESSION

A. Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation Government Code 54956.9(a)
Santa Fe Patio HOA v. GHILA Montesoro Investors, Case Nos. 37-2010-00012982-SC-SC-NC; 37-2010-00012928-SC-SC-NC; 37-2010-00012927-SC-SC-NC; 37-2010-00012926-SC-SC-NC; 37-2010-00012925-SC-SC-NC; 37-2010-00012924-SC-SC-NC; 37-2010-00012923-SC-SC-NC; 37-2010-00012922-SC-SC-NC; 37-2010-00012921-SC-SC-NC.

VII. CLOSING PROCEDURE, Adjournment

The next Special Meeting of the Board of Directors is scheduled for January 17, 2012 at the Borrego Water District
The next Regular Meeting of the Board of Directors is scheduled for January 25, 2012 at the Borrego Water District.

Borrego Water District
MINUTES
Special Meeting of the Board of Directors
November 1, 2011
10:30 a.m.
806 Palm Canyon Drive
Borrego Springs, CA 92004

I. OPENING PROCEDURES

- A. Call to Order: President Hart called the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m.
- B. Pledge of Allegiance: Those present stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.
- C. Roll Call: Directors: Present: President Hart, Vice President Lyle Brecht, Secretary/Treasurer Marshal Brecht, Estep
Staff: Jerry Rolwing, General Manager/Operations Manager
Public: Ray Delahay
- D. Approval of Agenda: ***MSC: Approving the Agenda as written.***
- E. Comments from Directors and Requests for Future Agenda Items: None
- F. Comments from the Public and Requests for Future Agenda Items: None

II. CLOSED SESSION

- A. Conference with Real Property Negotiators pursuant to Govt. Code section 54956.8:
Property: 199-080-21
Agency negotiators: Lee Estep, Beth Hart, and Jerry Rolwing
Negotiating party: Jack Cameron
Under negotiation: price and terms

The Board adjourned to closed session at 10:30 a.m., and the open session reconvened at 11:15 a.m. Mr. Rolwing announced that the Board had approved agreements with Cameron Brothers Construction LLP and Green Desert Landscape.

III. CURRENT BUSINESS MATTERS

- A. Discussion and possible action of lease agreement with Cameron Brothers Construction LLP: ***MSC: L.Brecht/Estep approving a five-year lease agreement with Cameron Brothers Construction LLP for the Club Circle Golf Course.***
- B. Discussion and possible action regarding maintenance agreement with Green Desert Landscape: ***MSC: L.Brecht/Estep approving an agreement with Green Desert Landscape for maintenance of the Club Circle Golf Course.***
- C. Discussion and possible approval of letter to Supervisor Horn requesting assistance for parks: The Board discussed options for supporting the Parks Coalition's efforts to fund continued operation of Christmas Circle. LAFCO had not yet responded to President Hart's inquiry. Suggestions included soliciting ratepayers for voluntary contributions or activating BWD's park powers and making an assessment. There are management and liability concerns. ***MSC: L.Brecht/Estep approving the letter from the Parks Coalition to Supervisor Horn requesting assistance.***

Director Estep announced that he would be unavailable for the November 16 9:00 a.m. meeting due to a prior commitment but hoped to participate in selection of the new Director. The Board agreed to consider that item at a special meeting on November 16 at 3:00 p.m.

IV. CLOSING PROCEDURE

Adjournment: There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:55 a.m. The next Regular Meeting of the Board of Directors is scheduled for November 16, 2011 at the Borrego Water District.

Borrego Water District
MINUTES
Regular Meeting of the Board of Directors
Wednesday, November 16, 2011
9:00 AM
806 Palm Canyon Drive
Borrego Springs, CA 92004

I. OPENING PROCEDURES

- A. Call to Order: President Hart called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.
- B. Pledge of Allegiance: Those present stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.
- C. Roll Call: Directors: Present: President Hart, Vice-President Lyle Brecht, Secretary/Treasurer Marshal Brecht, Estep (arrived at 3:00 p.m.)
Staff: Jerry Rolwing, General Manager
Diana Del Bono, Administrative Assistant
Lisa Foster, McDougal Love Eckis Beohmer & Foley
Wendy Quinn, Recording Secretary
Public: Carey Blakely, *Borrego Sun* Ray Delahay
Lane Sharman, BWX Julian Peabody
Bob McKee Hans Hoefer
Ray Shindler Dennis Dickinson
Don Davis Roberta La Frate
Marlene Engebretson (arrived at 3:00 p.m.)
- D. Approval of Agenda: *MSC: L.Brecht/M.Brecht approving the Agenda as written.*
- E. Approval of Minutes:

Special meeting of October 18, 2011

MSC: L.Brecht/M.Brecht approving the Minutes of the Special Meeting of October 18, 2011 as written.

Regular meeting of October 26, 2011

MSC: L.Brecht/M.Brecht approving the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of October 26, 2011 as amended (replacing the word "Agenda" with "Board package" when referring to Agenda attachments).

- F. Comments from Directors and Requests for Future Agenda Items: None

- G. Comments from the Public and Requests for Future Agenda Items: Bob McKee presented current and past water rates charged by BWD, summer and winter, for the various customer categories, with comparisons to other districts' rates.

- H. Correspondence:

Letter from R. Martinez family

The Martinez family lost its home to a fire and does not plan to rebuild. They want to continue water service but be exempted from sewer and trash fees. The Board agreed to handle it in the same manner as other vacant lot owners who have water only.

Letter from R. La Frate

Roberta La Frate expressed concern regarding water which often pours out of the Country Club tank. Jerry Rolwing explained it was due to the malfunction of the Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) system. Repair expenditure has been authorized.

Ms. La Frate was also concerned about the tamarisk trees surrounding the tank and the amount of water they used. The trees had been donated in order to screen the tank. The Board agreed to

check with local nurseries and/or park personnel regarding the type of tamarisk, and Mr. Rolwing will determine how much water is required for their irrigation.

Director Marshal Brecht reported that Don Pachuta had contacted him regarding water bill late fees incurred when he is traveling. Mr. Rolwing explained that he had offered Mr. Pachuta options such as automatic payment or advance deposit.

President Hart reported that she and Director Lyle Brecht had begun setting up a table at the Friday farmers' market to listen to customers' comments and answer questions.

I. Staff Reports:

A. Financial Reports – September 2011

Director Marshal Brecht reported that revenue and expenses were both lower than projected.

B. Manager/Operations Report

Mr. Rolwing reported that Don McKelvey was traveling and upon his return, they would meet to discuss best management practices for commercial and irrigation customers.

J. Attorney's Report: Lisa Foster reported that Cal Pers requires the use of its own resolution form in order to implement the Second Tier retirement plan for new hires. Kim Pitman has been in touch with them.

II. CURRENT BUSINESS MATTERS

A. Discussion and possible action of solar electric generation: Lane Sharman referred to his prior proposal to save the District money on its electrical costs by locating and connecting to a solar facility in Borrego Springs. The owner of the proposed site has now decided to sell the property due to a request from San Diego Gas & Electric to the Public Utilities Commission for a rate increase and a "network use" surcharge for solar users. He urged the Board to invite SDG&E and a solar provider to make presentations.

B. Discussion and possible approval of *Resolution 2011-11-1 authorizing investment of monies in the Local Agency Investment fund*: MSC: L.Brecht/M.Brecht adopting Resolution 2011-11-1 authorizing investment of monies in the Local Agency Investment Fund.

C. Review of CASGEM Groundwater Monitoring plan: A copy of a revised CASGEM Groundwater Monitoring Plan was included in the Board package for information.

D. Discussion and possible action on updating existing MOU on Groundwater Management issues: A 2004 MOU between the District and other local agencies, used to support grant applications, needs updating. It was referred to the Strategic Planning Committee.

E. Discussion and possible action regarding a motion: for General Counsel to research the form of legislation necessary for the District to have GWM authority for the Borrego Valley Groundwater Basin and for the Strategic Planning Committee to identify the costs associated with passing this legislation: MSC: L.Brecht/M.Brecht requesting the General Counsel to research the form of legislation necessary for the District to have groundwater management authority for the Borrego Valley Groundwater Basin and asking the Strategic Planning Committee to identify the costs associated with passing this legislation.

F. Discussion and possible action regarding increase IRWM budget to allow for RMC's additional meetings: The deadline for submission of the IRWM's planning grant proposal to DWR has been extended, and additional assistance from RMC was requested. **MSC: L.Brecht/M.Brecht amending the contract between BWD and RMC to increase the budget to \$53,462.**

G. Discussion and possible action regarding ABD-IRWM grant proposal budget development and 25% share: MSC: L.Brecht/M.Brecht authorizing Mr. Rolwing to negotiate with other IRWM participants in our region and offer them up to \$50,000 toward their matching share (money already spent by BWD) should the grant application succeed.

III. COMMITTEE REPORTS & PROPOSALS

Ad Hoc Committees

1. Audit Committee

Director Marshal Brecht hoped the audit would be complete by the December Board meeting.

2. Due-Diligence

Director Lyle Brecht explained that the electricity portion of the O&M budget designated by Rich Williamson as a "power fee" was not technically a separate power pass-through charge but an accounting notation.

3. Strategic Planning Committee/IRWM

The Strategic Planning Committee has been working with the IRWM on the planning grant proposal.

4. Executive Committee (Cameron)

President Hart announced that the Committee had completed its negotiations with the Camerons and entered into a new five-year lease and a maintenance agreement. The Committee will remain in effect for other efforts as needed, but the term "Cameron" will be removed from its title.

5. Operations & Management Committee

No report.

6. Asset Ad Hoc Committee

No report.

7. Christmas Circle Committee

President Hart is continuing her efforts to contact LAFCO for information on park powers.

8. Negotiating

The Board agreed to insert "(Montesoro)" in the title of the Committee.

IV. STAFF REPORTS

A. Water and Wastewater Operations Report – October 2011:

B. Water Production/Use Records – October 2011:

Mr. Rolwing reported that with the exception of the SCADA system, all facilities are running well.

V. ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 3:00 P.M.

At 11:55 a.m., the Board adjourned until 3:00 p.m.

VI. ADDITIONAL BUSINESS MATTERS

A. Discussion of and possible appointment of new Director: The Board reconvened at 3:00 p.m., and the two candidates for Director addressed the Board. Marlene Engebretson served as a Customer Service Representative for the District and was subsequently promoted to Office Manager. If appointed she would focus on conservation, education and public outreach. Ray Delahay retired from Metropolitan Water District, where he worked as a Heavy Equipment Operator and Maintenance Man. He had been attending Board meetings regularly and was familiar with the issues.

After discussion the Board agreed that both candidates were excellent, but Mr. Delahay's regular attendance at meetings was a plus and his operations experience would be a benefit. ***MSC: Estep/M.Brecht appointing Ray Delahay to the BWD Board of Directors.*** Mr. Rolwing administered the oath of office.

VII. CLOSING PROCEDURE

Adjournment. There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m. The next Regular Meeting of the Board of Directors is scheduled for December 14, 2011 at the Borrego Water District.



JOINT POWERS
INSURANCE AUTHORITY

P. O. Box 619082
Roseville, CA 95661-9082

phone
916.786.5742
800.231.5742

direct line
916.774.7050
800.535.7899

fax
916.774.7040

www.acwajpia.com

President
E.G. "Jerry" Gladbach

Vice President
Tom Cuquet

Chief Executive Officer
Walter "Andy" Sells

Executive Committee
Tom Cuquet
Joseph Dion
E.G. "Jerry" Gladbach
David T. Hodgin
W.D. "Bill" Knutson
Melody A. McDonald
Charles W. Muse
Randy A. Record
Lou Reinkens

November 28, 2011

Jerry Rolwing
Borrego Water District
P.O. Box 1870
Borrego Springs, CA 92004-1870

Dear Jerry:

Another year has passed and we are extremely happy with the great work that has been done by our districts and staff in reducing claims.

Congratulations to you and your district for receiving a Low Loss Ratio award. We encourage you to keep up the good work.

The JPIA wishes you the best in 2012.

Sincerely,

Walter A. Sells
Chief Executive Officer

Enclosure: Low Loss Ratio Certificate(s)

Borrego Water District Management Report – December 2011

By: Jerry Rolwing

BOARD REQUEST

Trees at the country club tank: I contacted Kathy Dice of the Park and she says that all of the tamarisk trees in the Borrego Valley are the non-invasive variety but she believes they all use large amounts of water. I spoke with the District's field supervisor, Roy Martinez, who says the duty operator turns on the water for a day to fill the basins when the trees start to droop. This occurs maybe once every two-three weeks depending on the season. There is no irrigation meter as I originally stated. Roy also told me that the crew could remove the trees if that is the Board's decision and it would take roughly one week's time.

FEDERAL LEVEL

U.S. Geological Survey: The USGS Community Advisory Group met November 15th and the minutes are attached (attachment A). Requests have been sent to agriculture and golf course representatives for the committee to interview which will assist in forming the proposed modeling scenarios.

U.S. Bureau of Reclamation: A meeting was held December 6th with Greg Krzys and Doug Blatchford of Reclamation, also attending were Vince Brooks of the Imperial Irrigation District, Mark Johnson of Coachella Valley WD, Debbie Livesay of Torres Martinez Indian Reservation and Coachella Valley WD Board member and Jim Livesay of Torres Martinez IR environmental department. Attending via telephone were Claudia Faunt and Lee Case of the US Geological Survey. The meeting reviewed the scope of work and Reclamation submitted a request for an additional \$20K for USGS staff time to use the model for climate change. It may be possible to integrate this extra task with the IRWM climate change, depending on the time constraints. Attached is the proposed updated time schedule (attachment B).

State and Tribal Assistance Grant (STAG): Waiting on letter from Bureau of Reclamation in regards to wheeling and the possibility of finding water sources for the final report scheduled for December 2011.

U.S. Department of Agriculture: I am working with District consulting Engineer David Dale to evaluate preparing a pre-application for one of our future capital improvement projects. The proposed 10" water main for Borrego Springs Road has been set up in segments for future construction over the next ten years. This possible funding opportunity could be in the form of a low interest loan, grant or combination of the two. This project is waiting for audited financials.

STATE LEVEL

The Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Work Plan is in progress and at this time, out for review with the Work Plan Committee. The next Stakeholder meeting will be held December 13th.

I have been working with DWR staff with their new CASGEM (California Statewide Groundwater Elevation Monitoring) uploading program. The DWR is still working out the kinks of the system and the plan is progressing.

On November 28th I attended the Assembly Subcommittee Hearing on the Salton Sea at the North Shore Yacht Club in Mecca (attachment C). Also included is the press coverage from the Imperial Valley Press.

COUNTY LEVEL

I had a great conversation with Jim Bennett on the groundwater ordinance comments. Jim was very encouraging that the County could address our submitted concerns.

LOCAL LEVEL

No action.

DISTRICT LEVEL

Four of the Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) sites have been restored to working condition with the new radio and controllers. This takes care of the more sensitive installations which have been returned to automatic control. Three more will be required as per the contractor's quotation that was previously authorized by the Board. These will be purchased in the first quarter of 2012.

Well ID4-2 (Country Club Rd.) has been approved for inactive status by the California Dept. of Health (attachment D). This well had reached its useful life when the water level approached the bottom of the well and has not been utilized since the incorporation of the new booster station and associated improvements connecting ID-5 to the Country Club Reservoir. The well is now available as a monitoring well for the CASGEM program. One of the provisions of the CASGEM program was the exclusion of municipal wells for security reasons.

GENERAL

No action.

MINUTES

USGS Community Advisory Group

November 15, 2011 9:00am

Attendees: John Peterson
Jim Rickard
Jack Laughlin
Jim Engelke
Mark Jorgensen
Beth Hart - BWD Strategic Advisory Committee
Lyle Brecht - Strategic Advisory Committee
Jerry Rolwing - BWD Staff

The committee met with the Board's Strategic Advisory Committee to obtain some direction from the Board of Directors. Jerry Rolwing reviewed the list of ongoing water management projects that the District is presently involved.

Director Lyle Brecht added three elements of the direction on groundwater management: "(1) developing a plan to manage the basin; (2) establishing an authority for enforcing the plan; and (3) providing a mechanism for funding the implementation of the plan. The District's General Counsel, in her review of California water law, has identified two promising alternative mechanisms for approaching the management of the basin before the state of California takes away local control of the groundwater basin: These two mechanisms are: (a) establishing a managed basin through a negotiated agreement among all pumpers of the basin that is then stipulated by the courts; and (b) pursuing the establishment of a groundwater management authority for the basin through legislation. If neither of these mechanisms are acceptable to basin pumpers, the other mechanism that is available is a court adjudication process. But local control of the basin would most likely be lost if this mechanism was utilized.

The rationale for beginning the above two processes at this time to establish a managed basin include: (1) it appears that a managed basin is required for importation projects to provide replenishment water to recharge the basin, especially any project involving water banking and pipeline financing; (2) extensive experience in nearby and other basins suggests that the longer-term economic costs for basin pumpers are much greater if a basin is left unmanaged. That is, a managed basin tends to improve the economic prospects of a community of users by reducing the risks of damaging the groundwater basin and its ability to provide water of a quality useful for irrigation and domestic water uses; and (3) recent research by the USGS on the present status of the basin suggests that the potential for damaging the basin and its ability to provide water of a quality useful for irrigation and domestic water uses is potentially a near-

term (within 50-years or so) economic possibility. Thus, there is a potentially large and growing risk for the basin to continue to remain unmanaged."

The committee decided to use a 50 year maximum time frame for the model run scenarios. One scenario would be where ultimate withdrawal equals recharge. Other agreed upon parameters were to use FYE 2011 Borrego Valley Water Usage figures generated by Jerry Rolwing, assign a ten year period for achieving a managed basin, 15-20 years before water quality issues will play a role and addressed the growth as an increase of 5,000 residents over the 50 year period. Three basin management scenarios will be reviewed; by economics, one by a managed basin approach and a third concept of purchasing the farmland with local funding and not utilizing the water credit program. Citrus fallowing by tree age was addressed. Trees could be grouped into three categories, old medium age and newly planted. This could be accomplished by reviewing aerial photos from various periods in history, consulting an agronomist or consulting with the local farmers.

There was discussion of future basin recharge with concern to climate change. Mark Jorgensen brought up the existing rainfall data of 6.6" at the Park Headquarters and 3-4" on the valley floor.

Future meetings were outlined as follows. Next meeting would feature a farm representative and a golf course representative. The following meeting would feature the County Sponsor Group and Chamber of Commerce. A follow up meeting with Peter Martin and Claudia Faunt will be set prior to a final report by the committee.

[Print](#) | [Close Window](#)

Subject: FW: Response requested: Modified SOW - USGS incorp 10182011.doc
From: "Krzys, Gregory A" <GKrzys@usbr.gov>
Date: Fri, Dec 02, 2011 11:56 am
To: "jerry@borregowd.org" <jerry@borregowd.org>
Attach: ATT00001.gif
Modified SOW - USGS incorp 10182011 ccf.doc

Jerry

The email below from USGS provides a cost estimate for their work to incorporate the aquifer modeling with the scenario modeling.

If you have time this afternoon after 130, please give me a call to discuss. Reclamation estimated \$25k for the work.

Thanks
Greg

Greg Krzys
Water Resources Planner
US Department of the Interior
Bureau of Reclamation
27708 Jefferson Ave., Suite 202
Temecula, CA 92590

p- (951) 695-5310
f- (951) 695-5319
e- gkrzys@usbr.gov

From: ccfaunt@usgs.gov [mailto:ccfaunt@usgs.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, November 15, 2011 5:31 PM
To: Krzys, Gregory A
Cc: Flint, Alan L.; Blatchford, Douglas B; Krzys, Gregory A; Flint, Lorraine E.; Martin, Peter; Gangopadhyay, Subhrendu
Subject: Re: Response requested: Modified SOW - USGS incorp 10182011.doc

Attached are our comments on the work plan. We made some adjustments to the dates based on our work schedule and made a best guess at how much time things might take.

An estimate of costs of what would be required beyond our current scope of work with the Borrego Water District:

Attachment B

	Labor	Hours	Gross Cost
	Hydrologist 1	150	\$23,411.00
	Hydrologist 2	40	\$8,597.00
	Hydrologist 3	50	\$7,727.00
	GIS Support	60	\$4,373.00
	Gross Labor Hours/Cost	300	\$44,108.00
			Miscellaneous supplies
			\$1,868.00
Gross Total Cost			\$45,976.00

If we need to discuss more of the details, let me know.

Claudia :-)

Claudia C. Faunt, Ph.D., P.E.
Hydrologist

U.S. Geological Survey
California Water Science Center
San Diego Projects Office
4165 Spruance Road, Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92101
(619) 225-6142

From: "Krzys, Gregory A" <GKrzys@usbr.gov>
To: "Krzys, Gregory A" <GKrzys@usbr.gov>, "Faunt, Claudia C." <ccfaunt@usgs.gov>, "Flint, Alan L." <aflint@usgs.gov>, "Flint, Lorraine E." <lflint@usgs.gov>, "Martin, Peter" <pmmartin@usgs.gov>
Cc: "Blatchford, Douglas B" <DBlatchford@usbr.gov>, "Gangopadhyay, Subhrendu" <sgangopadhyay@usbr.gov>
Date: 11/08/2011 04:49 PM
Subject: Response requested: Modified SOW - USGS incorp 10182011.doc

Please provide comments, edits, etc or approval on the document sent out last month by November 16th.

Thanks
Greg

From: Krzys, Gregory A
Sent: Tuesday, October 25, 2011 10:17 AM
To: 'ccfaunt@usgs.gov'; Flint, Alan L; 'flint@usgs.gov'; Martin, Peter
Cc: Blatchford, Douglas B; Gangopadhyay, Subhrendu
Subject: FW: Modified SOW - USGS incorp 10182011.doc

All-

Please review the attached document. This is the SOW for the Borrego project. Items identified in red are subtasks where Reclamation and USGS would coordinate modeling efforts.

A proposed schedule is also included.

Comments, edits, etc will be reviewed. From USGS staff, if you can prepare a draft budget proposal, that would be great.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Thanks
Greg

Greg Krzys
Water Resources Planner
US Department of the Interior
Bureau of Reclamation
27708 Jefferson Ave., Suite 202
Temecula, CA 92590

p- (951) 695-5310
f- (951) 695-5319
e- gkrzys@usbr.gov

Copyright © 2003-2011. All rights reserved.

1. Objectives/Scope Statement: (list features, deliverables, and objectives)

The Borrego Springs Community's sole water source is the region's aquifer. As demands in the Borrego basin are projected to exceed the natural supply to the basin's aquifer in the future, options are being explored to address potential imbalances.

2. Scope Definition:

The Southeast California Regional Basin Study (Study) will characterize current regional water supply and demand conditions. Based on the knowledge gleaned from the West Wide Climate Risk Assessment (WWCRA), the Study will assess risks to regional water supplies in the future. The Study will couple future supply scenarios with a projected range of water demands in the basin to determine the magnitude of the supply/demand imbalances. The imbalances will be addressed by identifying potential strategies and options.

Task 1.

Subtask 1.1 – Client Project Management and Administration. TSC and ESO will serve as technical leads for stakeholder outreach meetings. ESO will help develop a stakeholder communication management plan and provide a monthly report.

Subtask 1.2 – USGS-Reclamation Coordination. USGS and Reclamation will cooperate, coordinate, and schedule work between agencies, including local and state agencies affected by this work. These agencies could include the Borrego Springs Water District, the Imperial Irrigation District, the Coachella Valley Water District, the State of California, and other entities.

Task 2.

Subtask 2.1 – Gather Data. TSC will coordinate with ESO and the Southern California Area Office (SCAO) the work with local, state, and federal entities to gather historic demand data, and coordinate work to develop future supply and demand data. ESO and SCAO will collect information on aquifers, primarily, the Borrego Valley aquifer, the Clark Dry Lake Bed aquifer, and the Allegretti Farms aquifer. Information collected should be, but is not limited to, groundwater models, studies, reports, well logs, pump tests, and other information necessary to characterize the aquifers given past, present, and future conditions.

Subtask 2.2 – USGS data. Reclamation staff will work with USGS to access data, models, reports, and other information as part of this SOW. Reclamation agrees to coordinate overall data management with the USGS.

Deliverable: Technical Memo 1 describing findings of Task 2.

Task 3. Build historic and future demand scenarios. TSC will assemble and review historical and future demand data sets with support from ESO and SCAO. TSC will prepare three to four demand scenarios based on stakeholder demand projections, and based on the Colorado River Basin Study future demand estimates.

Task 4. Build historic and future water supply scenarios. TSC will prepare a maximum of five future supply scenarios from West Wide Climate Risk Assessment.

Deliverable: Technical Memo 2 to include results of Tasks 3 and 4.

Task 5. Water supply/demand modeling. Reclamation staff (TSC) will develop, test and evaluate, and run the water supply/demand model based on the mass balance approach.

Subtask 5.1 – Water supply scenario modeling. Reclamation will coordinate scenario development with the USGS using the MODFLOW model developed by the USGS for Borrego Springs to develop and/or refine the future water supply scenarios. Results, using the 69 GCMs, will be input into the Basin Characterization

Model (BCM) by the USGS. From the 69 GCMs, the USGS (with Reclamation's input/approval) will select up to 5 BCM output supply scenarios. These supply scenarios will include the minimum, maximum, and mean inflows, precipitation, and temperature (reference ET) data sets for the Borrego Basin. The BCM output will be input into the boundary conditions of the Borrego Springs groundwater model. Summary output data will be provided for each model run.

- a. Build new MODFLOW files
- b. Run BCM supply scenarios
- c. Plot (all and total through time)/Tabulate (min, max, median) BCM supply results
 - i. Inflows
 - ii. Precipitation
 - iii. Reference Evapotranspiration
 - iv. Water Demand
 - v. Change in storage (total, at various points?)
 - vi. Water levels/hydrographs at various locations
 - vii. Plot various hydrographs

Formatted: Font color: Red

Formatted: Font color: Red

Formatted: Font color: Red

Formatted: Font color: Red

Subtask 5.2 – Water demand scenario modeling. Reclamation and the USGS will run demand scenarios, based on well pumping scenarios as determined by the partners. Coordination with partners will be necessary. Demand scenarios will be run for each supply scenario developed in Subtask 5.1 above. Summary output data will be provided for each model run. Not to exceed 5 pumping demand scenarios for each supply scenario.

Deliverable: Technical Memo 3 describing results of Task 5.

Task 6. Analyze future water supply and demand gaps. TSC will prepare a matrix of water supply and demand scenarios and present the respective gaps. **Deliverable: Technical Memo 4** to report findings of Task 6.

Task 7. Analyze options and strategies to meet future supply gaps. TSC will support ESO to prepare a matrix of possible options and strategies to meet future supply gaps identified by TSC (Task 6).

Task 8. Determine the reasonableness of cost. TSC will support ESO to develop a cost and non-cost matrix for each scenario based on present and future values for each option to be identified as part of Task 7.

Task 9. Optimization of strategies. TSC will support ESO to address various options and optimization strategies and determine which combination of options is best suited for the gap analyses.

Task 10. Support the completion of Basin Study Report. TSC will support ESO to complete the Basin Study Report will be delivered to stakeholders for review and approval, and comments incorporated into the final report.

Tentative schedule:

1. March 27, 2012: Client Project Management and Administration (USBR)
2. October 21, 2011: Gather Data (USBR).
3. December 31, 2011: Finalize historical BCM output for groundwater model input (USGS)
- ~~4. January 31, 2012: Run water supply scenarios in groundwater model (USGS)~~
- ~~5-4. February 24, 2012: Build historic and future demand scenarios (USGS/USBR)~~
5. March 30, 2012: Build historic and future water supply scenarios (USBR)
6. March 30, 2012: Finalize all 69 GCM runs and BCM output (USGS)
7. April 15, 2012: From the 69 GCMs, select up to 5 BCM supply scenarios and determine any changes to municipal pumping, septic recharge, farm/crop distribution, crop type (USGS/USBR)
8. April 30, 2012: From the 5 BCM output, develop BCM supply scenarios and resample and format for MODFLOW model (precip, ET_o, streamflow/underflow) (USGS)
9. April 30, 2012: Historical MODFLOW model complete (USGS)
10. May 30, 2012: Run BCM supply scenarios supply scenarios in MODFLOW model (USGS)
- ~~6-11. May 11, 2012: Water supply/demand modeling (USBR)~~
- ~~7. July 1, 2012: MODFLOW model complete (USGS)~~
12. June 30, 2012: Run USBR supply scenarios in MODFLOW model (USGS)
- ~~8-13. July 12, 2012: Analyze future water supply and demand gaps (USBR)~~
- 9-14. August 22, 2012: Analyze options and strategies to meet future supply gaps (USBR)
15. September 30, 2012: Borrego Springs groundwater model study to review. Report will include BCM and USBR scenarios (USGS)
- 10-16. November 7, 2012: Determine the reasonableness of cost (USBR)

- Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0" + Indent at: 0.25"
- Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0" + Indent at: 0.25"
- Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0" + Indent at: 0.25"
- Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0" + Indent at: 0.25"
- Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0" + Indent at: 0.25"
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25", No bullets or numbering
- Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0" + Indent at: 0.25"
- Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0" + Indent at: 0.25"
- Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0" + Indent at: 0.25"
- Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0" + Indent at: 0.25"
- Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0" + Indent at: 0.25"
- Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0" + Indent at: 0.25"
- Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0" + Indent at: 0.25"
- Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0" + Indent at: 0.25"
- Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0" + Indent at: 0.25"

- | ~~41~~.17 December 31, 2012: Borrego Springs groundwater model study complete (USGS)
- | ~~42~~.18 January 23, 2012: Optimization of strategies (USBR).
- | ~~43~~.19 March 27, 2013: Support the completion of Basin Study Report (USBR).

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 +
Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 +
Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0" + Indent at:
0.25"

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 +
Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 +
Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0" + Indent at:
0.25"

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 +
Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 +
Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0" + Indent at:
0.25"

Project Management Plan – Small Project
(Short Form Instructions)

1. **Objectives/Scope Statement:** A sentence or phrase which describes the product of this work. A review, a report, a study, a collection of data, a model, an inspection, a design specification, etc.
2. **Scope Definition:** A sentence or two describing what, when, where, how, how much, and by whom.
3. **Schedule:** A list of milestones and who is responsible. Note: Items and dates that the client is responsible for providing and to which the schedule is dependent can be listed.
4. **Financial Plan:** A list of tasks, TSC groups, or tasks and groups and their associated staff days and nonlabor costs. Note: If earned value is to be performed, a second form will be necessary. There is a range of EV forms and spreadsheets that can be used, depending on the size and complexity of the project.
5. **Roles and Responsibilities:** A list of the key players and their titles and roles. Use separate table when more than one or two: project engineer, project technical specialist, group representative, group managers, team members, etc.
6. **Quality Control:** Describes the quality control process. Client review of work in progress, peer review, peer reviewer, checker, etc.
7. **Change Management:** Describes the change management process to include: forms to be used, thresholds of change for schedule and budget, use of contingency funding, contingency funds forms, update to service agreement, etc.
8. **Communication:** Lists regularly scheduled team meetings, conference calls, and status reports. Describes the content, frequency, and distribution of status reports.
9. **Risk Management:** Identifies potential risks which might affect the project, assesses the impact, and assigns responsibility for risk.
10. **Project Closeout:** Describes what, who, when, and how. Identifies how the final product will be delivered, final reports, feedback survey, team debriefing meeting, client closeout meeting, project records, financial closeout, etc. Note: The TSC Project Closeout Checklist may be used for reference.
11. **Signatures:** Must have the team leader, team leader's supervisor, and client contact signatures. Client sponsor signature is optional but strongly advised.

Note: Use attachments where more detail is needed. Reference attachments in their appropriate sections.

DATE: November 29, 2011

TO : Board of Directors

FROM: Jerry Rolwing

RE: Salton Sea Update

On November 28th the California Assembly Budget Subcommittee #3 on Resources and Transportation met at the North Shore Yacht Club in Mecca, CA. Three members of the Assembly were present including Brian Jones (our assemblyman), Rich Gordon (Chair) and Manuel Perez of Coachella. This meeting was set up by Assemblyman Perez's office to discuss the issues surrounding the Sea's restoration and included a field trip of the area for the representatives. Featured speakers were Anton Favorini-Csorba of the Legislative Analyst's Office and Kealii Bright of the Natural Resources Department. Mr. Favorini-Csorba said that there was \$6.5M remaining in the SB34 funding and that possibly future funding could come from three sources: beneficiaries, polluter fines or a public goods fee on water sales in the State. Mr. Bright outlined the various State bond measures that have been the source of funding including: \$50M from proposition 50, \$48M from prop 84. It was unclear but it appeared there was approximately \$33M remaining. Funding has been spent on the first phase of restoration which includes "ponding off" 3,000 acres of the Sea near the mouth of the New River and the associated "programatic EIR". Other funding \$133M for mitigation through the QSA (Quantification Settlement Agreement) of which \$45M has been spent and \$30M (\$6.2M spent) for Salton Sea Restoration were funds from the three water districts involved in the QSA, Imperial Irrigation District, Coachella Valley Water District and the San Diego County Water Authority. Estimates by State staff are \$8.9B over the next 75 years for restoration. Kim Delfino of Defenders of Wildlife Group emphasized the "deep frustration" with the State and that the project had been "studied to death" with no results. In accordance with the QSA, return flow from Imperial Valley farms will stop contributing water to the Sea in 2018.

General managers from both the Coachella Valley Water District and Imperial Irrigation District voiced their opinion that the project needs leadership which is missing under State control. Imperial County Supervisor Wyatt suggested that the government turn over the former military testing grounds for future solar projects to finance the restoration. Dr. Krantz of Redlands University outlined a plan that included a reduced Sea footprint to accommodate the lower flows and incorporate solar, geothermal, bio-diesel algae and hydroelectric power on the dry sections to pay for the continued restoration efforts.

The committee asked for a better understanding of the accounting and will be pushing for the passage of AB 939, transferring power to local control.

Salton Sea restoration effort draws Assembly subcommittee hearing



A man fishes outside the North Shore Yacht Club where a state hearing was held Monday to discuss the future of the Salton Sea. (ELIZABETH VARIN)

12:47 a.m. PST, November 29, 2011

NORTH SHORE — Violeta Lopez has been on the front line of the changes that are taking place in the Salton Sea.

The North Shore resident of 16 years has seen people move away, kids having health problems and the smell of the sea grow worse throughout the years, she said in Spanish. The residents there now only have one store in which to buy groceries, and Lopez attributes that among other things to a declining, super-salinated sea that appears no closer to getting better.

She wants to know when all the talk is going to stop and action will start to save the sea and the community she lives in. No one could answer Lopez's question, though much discussion settled Monday around how the state can move forward to help save the Salton Sea.

Sacramento came to the Salton Sea as the Assembly budget subcommittee on resources and transportation held a hearing at the North Shore Yacht Club, inviting local officials and residents to give their input on how they see the future of the largest inland body of water in the state. Assemblymen V. Manuel Perez, Richard Gordon and Brian Jones toured the sea and heard the continued frustration of residents and officials complaining about inaction at the state level.

"This is shameful and frightening," said Kim Delfino, California program director for Defenders of Wildlife, an environmental organization. "It's shameful that we spend so much time and so much money on studying the sea to death with no real benefit to show. It's frightening because the situation at the Salton

Sea is grim and the stakes are high.”

She, among others, expressed deep frustration in what they say is a significant amount of bond money spend on a lot of studies, but no projects to restore the sea. After eight years of working on getting something done and a project in the ground, Delfino said she’s losing hope for the sea.

With a view of the sea out the window, palm trees sprouting off the shore and birds flying by, the panel and audience members spoke of the funding sources, what governing body should be involved and a not-yet-approved plan for restoration.

The sea has been in trouble for years, and the continuation of the nation’s largest agriculture-to-urban water transfer has accelerated the receding shoreline and increased salinity that will likely make it hard in the future for fish to survive and birds to migrate to the sea, said Anton Favorini-Csorba, a California Legislative Analyst’s Office analyst for resources and environmental protection. The decreasing sea also poses a big risk to public health because it can increase the levels of air particulate matter in an area that already has bad air quality.

The state Legislature has set up three priorities for any plan to restore the sea, including restoring the shoreline for fish and bird habitats, eliminating air quality impacts and protecting the water quality, he said. However, with funding availability in limbo, the state will likely have to prioritize what it needs at the sea. The preferred plan to include all those priorities has an \$8.9 billion price tag, much of which will have to be paid upfront for capital projects.

Currently the state has about \$6.5 million of uncommitted funding for the sea, he said. “That doesn’t get us very far,” he said.

The state and locals are going to need to work together to prioritize the goals of restoring the sea, said Assemblyman Gordon, D-Palo Alto. He chairs the budget subcommittee on resources and transportation, the group that looked at eliminating the Salton Sea Restoration Council last year.

When the issues came up as to whether to fund restoration work while not having a governing body, members of the subcommittee had wanted to know more about the issues, Gordon said. That’s why the local meeting was scheduled.

“What we do to this sea is critically important, not only for this region, but the state of California,” he said.

For Assemblyman Perez, D-Coachella, the fight is not only political, but also personal. He remembers growing up in the area, swimming in the sea and catching corvina, he told the crowd.

Action needs to be taken now in order to save the sea, he said. The sea is running out of time.

He added he thinks there’s great momentum to see change done, and he hopes to work with both the state and local sources to find a solution to the problem that has plagued the area for decades.

Residents made up a good portion of the crowd that filled two rooms at the yacht club. People stood

outside the room, peering in, while others sat through the three-hour meeting waiting to give their opinions on the sea restoration, like Bombay Beach resident Sonia Herbert.

"We live right on the sea," she said. "We're just hoping somebody will do something soon."

Staff Writer Elizabeth Varin can be reached at evarin@ivpressonline.com or 760-337-3441.
Copyright © 2011, Imperial Valley Press



Ron Chapman, MD, MPH
Director

State of California—Health and Human Services Agency
California Department of Public Health



EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
Governor

December 2nd, 2011

Jerry Rowling
General Manger
Borrego Water District
P.O. Box 1870
Borrego Springs, CA 92004

**BORREGO WATER DISTRICT, SYSTEM NUMBER 3710036
PERMIT AMENDMENT 05-14-11PA-049: INACTIVE STATUS OF WELL ID4-2**

On September 23, 2011, California Department of Public Health (CDPH) received updated information from Borrego Water District (BWD) on the status of Well ID4-2. In the updated information provided to CDPH, Well ID4-2 is now reported as inactive due to a significant drop in the static water elevation. BWD has physically disconnected the well from the water system but will monitor the static water elevation to determine if the well can be placed into production in the future.

CDPH hereby approves your permit application to inactivate Well ID4-2, contingent on the following provisions:

1. Well ID4-2 is no longer approved as a source of supply for BWD and shall remain physically disconnected from the potable water distribution system.
2. BWD shall ensure that Well ID4-2 is maintained in a condition that prevents surface water runoff into the well.
3. BWD shall submit a permit application and received CDPH approval prior to reactivating Well ID4-2 and placing the well into production.

Well ID4-2 is hereby waived from the water quality monitoring requirements pursuant to Title 22, Division 4, Chapter 15. If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Alan Tell or me at (619) 525-4159.

Sincerely,

Sean Sterchi, P.E.
District Engineer

Enclosure 1: List of Approved Sources for Borrego Water District

cc: Mark McPherson, Chief, Land and Water Quality Division, County of San Diego,
Department of Environmental Health

Southern California Drinking Water Field Operations Branch
1350 Front Street, Room 2050, San Diego, CA 92101
(619) 525-4159 (619) 525-4383 Fax
Internet Address: www.cdph.ca.gov

Enclosure 1
List of Approved Sources – Borrego Water District

Source	PS Code	Status	Production Capacity, gpm
Well ID1 – 08	3710036-005	Active	350
Well ID1 - 10	3710036-006	Active	300
Well ID1 – 12	3710036-007	Active	650
Well ID1 – 16	3710036-008	Active	900
Well ID4 – 04	3710036-015	Active	300
Well ID4 – 10	3710036-011	Active	80
Well ID4 – 11	3710036-010	Active	1,000
Well ID4 – 18	3710036-012	Active	250
Well ID5 – 05	3710036-032	Active	1,000
Wilcox Well	3710036-020	Active	200



United States Department of the Interior

U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

California Water Science Center
6000 J Street, Placer Hall
California State University
Sacramento, California 95819-6129
Phone: (916) 278-3000 Fax: (916) 278-3070
<http://water.wr.usgs.gov>

November 9, 2011

Mr. Jerry Rolwing, General Manager and Operations Manager
Borrego Water District
806 Palm Canyon Drive
Borrego Springs, California 92004

Dear Mr. Rolwing:

This letter confirms discussions between our respective staffs concerning the continuation of the cooperative water-resources program between the Borrego Water District (BWD) and the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) to delineate the hydrogeology and water availability of the Borrego Valley, California. The agreement end date will be extended from October 31, 2011 to December 31, 2012 to allow time to collect and analyze depth-dependent water-quality data and to evaluate multiple water-management scenarios developed in consultation with BWD.

The study consists of five major tasks: (1) compile hydrogeologic data; (2) collect land-elevation data; (3) convert existing USGS finite element model to MODFLOW; (4) update model with current information, and (5) prepare reports. A detailed description of progress of these tasks in Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (FFY11) and plans and costs for these tasks in FFY12 and the first quarter of FFY13 is included as an attachment to this letter.

As originally proposed and agreed to in Joint Funding Agreement (JFA) 09W4CAD23400 A2, the FFY11 budget was \$161,950, with \$131,500 the responsibility of BWD and \$30,450 provided by USGS Federal matching funds (FMF). In May of 2011 USGS added an additional \$50,000 of USGS FMF, raising the USGS FMF to a total of \$80,450 09W4CAD23400 A3. During FFY11, approximately \$153,660 was expended on the project: \$76,830 of BWD funds and \$76,830 of USGS FMF. In addition, BWD provided \$8,217 to contract a pump in lieu of USGS providing the equipment and personnel. Therefore, a total of \$8,217 from Task 2, depth dependent data is reduced by this amount, and reflected in table 1. BWDs total contribution to the program to be reduced in this amendment agreement by \$8,217.

Mr. Jerry Rolwing, General Manager and Operations Manager, Borrego Water District

Subject to the availability of FMF, the USGS would provide an additional \$28,900 to assist in the completion of the study, providing a total of \$211,650.00. A breakdown of the costs associated with each task for the modified budget are provided in the enclosed table 1.

As agreed to at the commencement of this study, the USGS will provide amendments to the Joint Funding Agreement (JFA) yearly for this study. The amendments to the JFA document the amount of BWD and USGS funding that will be contributed to the study each Federal Fiscal Year. This JFA is for the period October 1, 2008 to December 31, 2012.

Enclosed, you will find three copies of JFA 09W4CAD23400, Amendment 4, for your approval. Work performed with funds from this agreement will be conducted on a fixed-price cost basis. If you are in agreement with this proposed program, please return two copies of the JFA with original signatures to our office for further processing. The third copy of the JFA is for your files. After signature by the USGS, a fully executed original of the JFA will be forwarded for your records.

The USGS is required to have an agreement in place prior to any work being performed on a project. Your immediate attention to processing this JFA would be greatly appreciated, so we can continue work on the project as soon as possible.

If you have any questions concerning this program, please contact Peter Martin, in our San Diego Project Office, at (619) 225-6127. If you have any administrative questions, please contact Irene Rios, in our San Diego Office, at (619) 225-6156.

Sincerely,



Eric G. Reichard
Director
USGS California Water Science Center

Enclosures

cc: Peter Martin, USGS CAWSC
Claudia C. Faunt, USGS CAWSC

Table 1. Summary of costs by task and federal fiscal year.

Tasks	FY2009		FY2010		FY2011		FY2012		Total	Total
	Funding	Billed	Carryover*	Funding	Billed	Carryover*	Funding	To Be Billed	Planned	Actual
Task 1: Compile Data										
Hydrogeology	\$55,800	\$40,409	\$15,391	\$20,000	\$35,391	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$75,800	\$75,800
BCM	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$0	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$25,000	\$25,000
Task 2: Data Collection										
GPS	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$0	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$47,000	\$47,000
InSar	\$18,000	\$18,000	\$0	\$18,000	\$18,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$36,000	\$36,000
Depth-dependent data										
Analysis										
Task 3: Convert Model	\$12,250	\$12,250	\$0			\$0	\$30,000	\$-8,217a	\$30,000	\$21,783
Task 4: Update Model	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$0			\$0	\$50,000	\$3,620	\$50,000	\$50,000
Task 5: Prepare Report	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$0	\$10,250	\$10,250	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$12,250	\$12,250
TOTAL Funding	\$178,050	\$162,659	\$15,391	\$215,250	\$146,009	\$84,632	\$211,950	\$28,900	\$76,150	\$625,933
USGS matching funds	\$46,858	\$46,858	\$0	\$55,442	\$55,442	\$0	\$80,450	\$3,620	\$211,650	\$211,650
Borrogo Water District funds	\$131,192	\$115,801	\$15,391	\$159,808	\$90,567	\$84,632	\$131,500	-\$8,217	\$422,500	\$414,283

a. Final costs reflect the expenditure of \$8,217 of BWD funds to contract the pump for completion of this task in lieu of USGS equipment and personnel to be credited back to BWD via Joint Funding Agreement (JFA) 09W4CAD23400 Amendment 4.

b. Federal Matching Funds available and applied in the amount of \$46,380 in FY11.

*Funding less billed for previous year

Form 9-1366
(Oct. 2005)

**U.S. Department of the Interior
U.S. Geological Survey
Joint Funding Agreement**

Customer #: 6000000968 CA234
Agreement #: 09W4CAD23400 A4
Project #:
TIN #: 95-3584612
Fixed Cost Agreement Yes No

Page 1 of 2

**FOR
WATER RESOURCES INVESTIGATIONS**

THIS AGREEMENT is entered into as of the 31 day of OCTOBER, 2011, by the U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, party of the first part, and the BORREGO WATER DISTRICT, party of the second part.

1. The parties hereto agree that subject to availability of appropriations and in accordance with their respective authorities there shall be maintained in cooperation to delineate the hydrogeology and water availability of the Borrego Valley, California, herein called the program. The USGS legal authority is 43 USC 36C; 43 USC 50; and 43 USC 50b.
2. The following amounts shall be contributed to cover all of the cost of the necessary field and analytical work directly related to this program. 2(b) includes In-Kind Services in the amount of \$0.

(a) \$28,900.00 by the party of the first part during the period
October 1, 2008 to December 31, 2012

(b) \$-8,217.00 by the party of the second part during the period
October 1, 2008 to December 31, 2012

USGS DUNS is 1761-38857. Total funding for the USGS portion of this agreement, including this amendment is \$211,650.00. Borrego Water District funding amount of \$422,500.00 is reduced to \$414,283.00 by the amount of \$8,217.00. Total funding for the Borrego Water District portion of this agreement, including this amendment is \$414,283.00.

- (c) Additional or reduced amounts by each party during the above period or succeeding periods as may be determined by mutual agreement and set forth in an exchange of letters between the parties.
- (d) The performance period may be changed by mutual agreement and set forth in an exchange of letters between the parties.
3. The costs of this program may be paid by either party in conformity with the laws and regulations respectively governing each party.
4. The field and analytical work pertaining to this program shall be under the direction of or subject to periodic review by an authorized representative of the party of the first part.
5. The areas to be included in the program shall be determined by mutual agreement between the parties hereto or their authorized representatives. The methods employed in the field and office shall be those adopted by the party of the first part to insure the required standards of accuracy subject to modification by mutual agreement.
6. During the course of this program, all field and analytical work of either party pertaining to this program shall be open to the inspection of the other party, and if the work is not being carried on in a mutually satisfactory manner, either party may terminate this agreement upon 60 days written notice to the other party.
7. The original records resulting from this program will be deposited in the office of origin of those records. Upon request, copies of the original records will be provided to the office of the other party.

Form 9-1366
continued

U.S. Department of the Interior
U.S. Geological Survey
Joint Funding Agreement

Customer #: 6000000968 CA234
Agreement #: 09W4CAD23400 A4
Project #:
TIN #: 95-3584612

- 8. The maps, records, or reports resulting from this program shall be made available to the public as promptly as possible. The maps, records, or reports normally will be published by the party of the first part. However, the party of the second part reserves the right to publish the results of this program and, if already published by the party of the first part shall, upon request, be furnished by the party of the first part, at costs, impressions suitable for purposes of reproduction similar to that for which the original copy was prepared. The maps, records, or reports published by either party shall contain a statement of the cooperative relations between the parties.
- 9. USGS will issue billings utilizing Department of the Interior Bill for Collection (form DI-1040). Billing documents are to be rendered **quarterly**. Payments of bills are due within 60 days after the billing date. If not paid by the due date, interest will be charged at the current Treasury rate for each 30 day period, or portion thereof, that the payment is delayed beyond the due date. (31 USC 3717; Comptroller General File B-212222, August 23, 1983).

U.S. Geological Survey
United States
Department of the Interior

BORREGO WATER DISTRICT

USGS Point of Contact

Customer Point of Contact

Name: Irene A. Rios, Budget Analyst
Address: 6000 J Street, Placer Hall
Sacramento, California 95819-6129
Telephone: 619-225-6156
Email: iaros@usgs.gov

Name: Jerry Rolwing, General Manager and
Operations Manager
Address: Borrego Water District
806 Palm Canyon Drive
Borrego Springs, California 92004
Telephone: 760-767-5806
Email: jerry@borregowd.org

Signatures

Signatures

By _____ Date _____
Name: Eric G. Reichard
Title: Director, USGS California Water
Science Center

By _____ Date _____
Name: Jerry Rolwing
Title: General Manager and Operations
Manager

By _____ Date _____
Name:
Title:

MOTION: To ask the Due Diligence Committee to research the cost/benefits of Automated Meter Reading (AMR), and accounting and billing software upgrade.

Rationale: Introducing AMR (automatic meter reading) and updating the District's accounting and billing software may potentially offer an opportunity for significant annuity savings. At least that has been the experience of many water utilities in the region. A consideration for any investment in AMR is its ability to readily interface with the District's accounting and billing system. However, before the Board makes any decision to formally investigate this possible opportunity due to the large capital commitment such a project would entail, it may be prudent to ask the Due Diligence Committee to investigate whether the Board should pursue this opportunity to the next level based on such a project's potential ROIC (return on invested capital).

MOTION: To extend Audit Committee work to prepare for FY 2012 audit and improved financial reporting format.

Rationale: The Audit Committee's desire for the FY 2011 statements was to have them available by September/October 2011. This was not possible due to the considerable work involved with cleaning up the various accounting issues the previous Board and GM left behind. Most of these issues have been addressed in the FY 2011 audited statements that should be available by the January 2012 Board meeting. The Audit Committee would now like to work with the auditors to provide FY 2012 statements, if possible, in the September/October 2012 timeframe.

MOTION: To ask the General Manager to present a report on possible emergency funding mechanisms at the February Board workshop.

Rationale: What could potentially disrupt the best laid plans and decisions of the Board would be an emergency that makes a call on cash that is not readily available. This past year, water utilities from Maine to Florida, from Pennsylvania to Arkansas and Texas have needed to rely on their reserves for emergencies. Prudent financial management suggests that the Board may wish to be aware of potential options to raise cash in an emergency before any such emergency should arise, given the present and expected near-term status of the District's reserves.

The report would describe the opportunities for Emergency funding. E.g. due to an unforeseen and unfortunate emergency event (fire, earthquake, flood, etc.), the District is faced with \$1.5M in repairs to get its system back up and running. Where might this funding come from and how long might it take to obtain so as to begin work restoring water service to its customers?


[Contact Us](#) [SiteMap](#) [Help](#) [RSS](#) [Home](#)
[Home](#) > [Find Grant Opportunities](#) > [Search Grant Opportunities](#) > [Search Results](#) > Synopsis


FOR APPLICANTS

[Applicant Login](#)
[Find Grant Opportunities](#)
[Basic Search](#)
[Browse by Category](#)
[Browse by Agency](#)
[Advanced Search](#)
[Email Subscription](#)
[Get Registered](#)
[Apply for Grants](#)
[Track My Application](#)
[Applicant Resources](#)
[Search FAQs, User Guides and Site Information](#)
[APPLICANT SYSTEM-TO-SYSTEM](#)
[FOR GRANTORS](#)
[ABOUT GRANTS.GOV](#)
[HELP](#)
[CONTACT US](#)
[SITE MAP](#)

WaterSMART: Water and Energy Efficiency Grants for FY 2012

[Synopsis](#)
[Full Announcement](#)
[Application](#)

The synopsis for this grant opportunity is detailed below, following this paragraph. This synopsis contains all of the updates to this document that have been posted as of **11/07/2011**. If updates have been made to the opportunity synopsis, update information is provided below the synopsis.

If you would like to receive notifications of changes to the grant opportunity click [send me change notification emails](#). The only thing you need to provide for this service is your email address. No other information is requested.

Any inconsistency between the original printed document and the disk or electronic document shall be resolved by giving precedence to the printed document.

Document Type:	Grants Notice
Funding Opportunity Number:	R12SF80049
Opportunity Category:	Discretionary
Posted Date:	Nov 07, 2011
Creation Date:	Nov 07, 2011
Original Closing Date for Applications:	Jan 19, 2012
Current Closing Date for Applications:	Jan 19, 2012
Archive Date:	Jan 20, 2012
Funding Instrument Type:	Grant
Category of Funding Activity:	Natural Resources
Category Explanation:	
Expected Number of Awards:	50
Estimated Total Program Funding:	\$18,000,000
Award Ceiling:	\$1,500,000
Award Floor:	\$0
CFDA Number(s):	15.507 -- WaterSMART (Sustaining and Manage America's Resources for Tomorrow)
Cost Sharing or Matching Requirement:	Yes

Eligible Applicants

Others (see text field entitled "Additional Information on Eligibility" for clarification)

Additional Information on Eligibility:

Under P.L. 111-11, Section 9502, an eligible applicant is a State, Indian tribe, irrigation district, water district, or other organization with water or power delivery authority. Applicants must also be located in the western United States or Territories as identified in the Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902, as amended and supplemented; specifically: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wyoming, American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Virgin Islands. Those not eligible include the following entities: • Federal governmental entities • Institutions of higher education • Individuals

Agency Name

Bureau of Reclamation - Denver Office

Description

The Nation faces an increasing set of water resource challenges. Aging infrastructure, rapid population growth, depletion of groundwater resources, impaired water quality associated with particular land uses and land covers, water needed for human and environmental uses, and climate variability and change all play a role in determining the amount of fresh water available at any given place and time. Water shortages and water-use conflicts have become more commonplace in many areas of the United States, even in normal water years. As competition for water resources grows—for crop irrigation, growing cities and communities, energy production, and the environment—the need for information and tools to aid water resource managers also grows. Water issues and challenges are increasing across the Nation, but particularly in the West, due to prolonged drought. These water issues are exacerbating the challenges facing traditional water management approaches which by themselves no longer meet today's needs. The U.S. Department of the Interior's (Department) WaterSMART (Sustain and Manage America's Resources for Tomorrow) Program establishes a framework to provide Federal leadership and assistance on the efficient use of water, integrating water and energy policies to support the sustainable use of all natural resources, and coordinating the water conservation activities of various Department bureaus and offices. Through the Program, the Department is working to achieve a sustainable water management strategy to meet the Nation's water needs. The objective of this Funding Opportunity Announcement (FOA) is to invite States, Indian tribes, irrigation districts, water districts, and other organizations with water or power delivery authority to leverage their money and resources by cost sharing with Reclamation on projects that seek to conserve and use water more efficiently, increase the use of renewable energy and improve energy efficiency, benefit endangered and threatened species, facilitate water markets, or carry out other activities to address climate-related impacts on water or prevent any water-related crisis or conflict. Water conservation, use of water markets, and improved efficiency are crucial elements of any plan to address western United States water issues. With leveraged water and energy efficiency grants, an important step will be taken towards increasing conservation for a more efficient use of water in the West.

Link to Full Announcement

If you have difficulty accessing the full announcement electronically, please contact:

Michelle Maher
Grants Officer
Phone 303-445-2025 [Grants Officer](#)

Synopsis Modification History

There are currently no modifications for this opportunity.

Anza Borrego Desert Planning Region Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan

Tuesday November 8, 2011
1:30 – 3:30 p.m.

Borrego Water District (BWD)
806 Palm Canyon Drive, Borrego Springs, CA 92004

DRAFT NOTES

Action items are shown in italics

Attendees:

Jerry Rolwing, BWD

Lyle Brecht, BWD

Beth Hart, BWD

Linda Haddock, Borrego
Springs Chamber of
Commerce

Clark Shimeall, Resident

John Peterson, Anza-
Borrego Foundation

Ray Schindler, Resident

Mike Spieckerman,
Roadrunner Tree Farm

Tish Berge, RMC

Crystal Mohr, RMC

Attending by Phone:

Anna Aljabiry, DWR

Anthony Barry, San Diego
County Flood Control

Rosa Reagles, Salton CSD

Tulvio Durand, Anza Grant
Writing Committee

Dale Schafer, Center for
Collaborative Policy

Ali Taghavi, RMC-WRIME

Agenda:

Welcome and Introductions

- The group made self introductions, and Jerry Rolwing welcomed the group.

Review Outcomes of Last Meeting, October 11, 2011

- Jerry Rolwing provided an overview of the previous Anza Borrego Desert (ABD) stakeholders meeting, which took place on October 11, 2011. He noted that during this meeting, stakeholders decided to form two separate committees to complete work necessary for the IRWM process. One committee, the Work Plan Workgroup, convened to provide input necessary to develop an outline of the work plan that will be included within the ABD Planning Grant Round 2 application. The second committee, the Governance Committee, convened to discuss the list of stakeholders developed at the previous meeting and provide outreach to targeted stakeholders.
- Tish Berge added that stakeholders also participated in several exercises at the previous meeting. One exercise involved identifying all potential stakeholders within the ABD Region. The second exercise involved identifying and ranking the ABD Region's key issues.

DWR Report

- Anna Aljabiry provided an overview of DWR updates. Ms. Aljabiry noted that DWR has released the Draft Project Solicitation Package (PSP), which includes guidelines for development of IRWM Planning Grant applications. Ms. Aljabiry

also noted that there will be \$9 million available for Round 2 Planning Grants. Ms. Aljabiry noted that while DWR has not released an official due date for the planning grant applications, however it is anticipated that they will be due in late February, 2012.

- Ms. Aljabiry noted that DWR is in the process of conducting Process Improvement Workshops to solicit feedback on how to improve the Proposition 84 IRWM process. The closest workshop pertaining to the ABD Region will be held in Chino on December 6, 2011. Information is available here: <http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/processimprovement.cfm>
- Ms. Aljabiry noted that information regarding workshops and other updates are available to stakeholders through DWR's mailing list. Stakeholders can join the mailing list by sending an email to the following email address: DWR_IRWM@water.ca.gov
 - *Tish Berge will send a link to DWR's mailing list sign-up to stakeholders.*
- Tish Berge inquired if DWR has an opinion regarding whether IRWM Regions should seek the full possible Planning Grant request (\$1 million), or if DWR sees it as more appropriate for smaller regions such as the ABD Region to seek less funding.
 - Ms. Aljabiry responded that DWR does not have a preference, and does not take the size of regions into consideration when allocating Planning Grant funds. She noted that there are more than nine regions that could request planning grant funding; therefore it is possible that not every region that applies will be awarded full funding. On this note, Ms. Aljabiry noted that DWR could choose to either partially fund all applications, or could prioritize them such that some regions are fully funded (\$1 million), and some are not. These outcomes depend on many factors such as the amount of applications received, and the quality of each application. As such, it is too early at this time for DWR to make such decisions.
 - Ms. Aljabiry's recommendation to the ABD Region is to do the best they can to make the Planning Grant Application strong such that it scores highly per DWR's scoring criteria (listed within the PSP).

Meeting Goals and Objectives

- Tish Berge presented the proposed goals and objectives for the meeting at hand, and inquired if anybody in the group had additions or questions.
- Tulvio Durand noted that in September he submitted a planning grant proposal to the Borrego Water District, which addresses some of the ABD Region's primary concerns (water supply). He inquired if this proposal is still being considered.
 - Tish Berge noted that at this time the group has moved forward with development of the general work plan tasks through the Work Plan Workgroup, and is not looking to add more studies at this time.
 - *Jerry Rolwing will have a conversation with Tulvio Durand at a later date to discuss his proposal.*

Planning Grant and IRWM Schedule

- Tish Berge presented this item, noting that in the Work Plan Outline and other materials it has been assumed to date that the ABD Region will move forward with development of an IRWM Plan from 2012 to 2014, and therefore will not

have an adopted Plan until 2014. IRWM regions must have an adopted IRWM Plan to apply for IRWM-related implementation grant funding. Therefore, this assumption would render the ABD Region ineligible for Proposition 1E (stormwater and flood management) funds, because the last round of funding for Proposition 1E is anticipated to occur in the summer of 2012. In addition, the ABD Region would not be eligible for Round 2 Proposition 84 Implementation Grant money, because this grant cycle is anticipated to occur in late 2012.

- Tish Berge noted that the Round 3 Proposition 84 Implementation Grant funding is anticipated to be the largest funding round, so the ABD Region would still have the opportunity to apply for substantial grant funding even if they do not have an adopted IRWM Plan until 2014.
- Tish Berge then asked the stakeholders for their input on this matter. The following is the discussion regarding scheduling:
 - It was inquired if the ABD IRWM Region would receive preferential treatment in the Round 3 Proposition 84 Implementation Grant funding, since other regions that are farther along in the planning process would be eligible to apply for all three implementation funding rounds.
 - Anna Aljabiry noted that at this time DWR has not given such preferential treatment. She noted that it is too early to say at this time how DWR will choose to score Round 3 Implementation Grant applications.
 - It was inquired if the County of San Diego Flood Control is anticipating to have any implementation projects for the ABD Region prepared such that the Region could apply for Proposition 1E funding.
 - Anthony Barry noted that at this time the County does not have funding to apply for this grant, nor do they have money to provide requisite matching funds.
 - It was asked if it is possible to update just part of the IRWM Plan, which would be possible by the end of 2012 to make the Region eligible for funding.
 - Anna Aljabiry noted that many regions put forth “preliminary” IRWM plans to be eligible for funding rounds, and then later update their plans to meet DWR requirements.
 - Along the discussion of flood control, it was inquired what the County would require in order to lift existing development restrictions.
 - Anthony Barry noted that the County is currently working on a geomorphic analysis to remap the existing floodplain. This analysis is anticipated to be in the ballpark of \$200,000. The County has learned from FEMA that some of the conclusions reached in the prior Boyle Report are in conflict with existing FEMA and California Building Code (CBC) regulations. Therefore, the new geomorphic analysis is being completed to re-delineate the floodplain boundary and depths and achieve compliance with State and Federal regulations.
 - *From now on, a standing item on the agenda for ABD IRWM meetings will include an update on the County’s current floodplain analysis effort.*

Technical “State of the Basin” Update

- Mr. Ali Taghavi provided an update on the *State of the Basin* report that RMC-Wrime is conducting through their technical services contract with DWR. He noted that there was a meeting held with DWR on November 8th, during which DWR provided comments regarding the proposed work plan. Mr. Taghavi will now incorporate changes, finalize, and re-submit to the Southern California DWR office. Once the work plan is approved by DWR, Mr. Taghavi will send the work plan to stakeholders. Work is anticipated to be authorized in late 2011 and to begin in early 2012.
 - It was inquired what the approximate cost for this study will be.
 - Mr. Taghavi noted that the cost has not been finalized, but he anticipates that it will be between \$80,000 and \$100,000.

Stakeholder Participation

- Dale Schafer provided an overview of stakeholder outreach that she is conducting in conjunction with the ABD Region stakeholders through a contract with DWR. She noted that the current scope of work is being vetted, and will likely be available to stakeholders in December 2011. Ms. Schafer is working with DWR, and has explained to them that the ABD Region is currently undertaking a legitimate stakeholder process, and will continue to do so. She also noted that DWR has requested that she conduct her work in conjunction with work done in Hemet, California in order to reduce travel costs.
- Ms. Schafer then noted that the stakeholder outreach that has recently been conducted was a follow-up to the previous ABD Region meeting, where stakeholders identified a robust list of potential stakeholders. Following that meeting, Beth Hart volunteered to help Ms. Schafer in the next steps.
- Ms. Hart provided an overview of the stakeholder outreach process following the previous ABD Region meeting. She noted that she worked with Ms. Schafer to identify stakeholders within the entire stakeholder list, which would likely be viable stakeholders that would attend meetings and get involved. She noted that those not on a payroll to attend meetings or those without a vested interest in the process will likely not be viable stakeholders.
- Ms. Hart noted that she worked to contact multiple stakeholders, including Harry Jones from the School District. She noted that Mr. Jones would likely have to receive approval from his Board of Directors before agreeing to officially participate in IRWM efforts. Lyle Brecht contacted David Schaack, President of the Montosoro Home Owners Association (HOA) to determine if the HOA would attend. Mr. Rolwing noted that he was in contact with a representative from the HOA, who was planning to attend the current day’s meeting, but could not due to a scheduling conflict.
- Ms. Schafer noted that she has also been in contact with Kathy Dice of the Anza-Borrego Desert State Park. Ms. Schafer noted that she reached out to a representative from Shelter Valley, who was not interested in being a stakeholder. In addition, Ms. Schafer is working at gaining attendance from Canebrake, Majestic Pines, and Jacumba (all water-related authorities within the Region). Mr. Rolwing noted that he has been in contact with the General Manager of Jacumba, who responded positively to being involved. Mr. Rolwing was also in contact with representatives of the Los Coyotes tribal organization.

He noted that stakeholder interest with this group is low, because while tribal lands lie within the Region, no tribal members live within the Region.

- Ms. Schafer noted that all of these efforts are substantial, and demonstrate that the Region is putting forward a good-faith effort to increase stakeholder involvement.
- *Ms. Schafer will send an overview (summary) of the stakeholder work completed to date for inclusion within the Planning Grant application.*

Work Plan Workgroup Report

- Tish Berge provided an overview of this item. Ms. Berge provided attendees with handout slides for the discussion.
- Ms. Berge noted that the Work Plan Workgroup consisted of Lyle Brecht, Linda Haddock, John Peterson, and Jerry Rolwing. Members met twice via conference call to determine work plan tasks, discuss approximate levels of effort, review an annotated outline, and provide feedback on the outline. The annotated outline was also made available to stakeholders, and provided to stakeholders via email prior to the meeting.
- Ms. Berge described that the way the Work Plan is written is that stakeholder outreach and the regional water resources plans feed into and will be incorporated into the 2014 ABD IRWM Plan.
- Ms. Berge also provided an overview of DWR's scoring criteria for work plans, noting that emphasis is placed on demonstration that the work plan will lead to development of an IRWM Plan that is compliant with DWR standards. As such, Ms. Berge noted that in RMC's experience with winning planning grant applications, approximately 1/3 of the budget is spent on outreach, planning studies (regional water resources plans), and the IRWM Plan. This recommendation is not in accordance with the original input of the Work Plan Workgroup, and so should be discussed by stakeholders.
- Crystal Mohr then provided an overview of the proposed work plan tasks and deliverables. She noted that Task 1, Outreach and Program Administration and Task 2, Regional Water Resources Plans Development lead into Task 3, Updating the ABD IRWM Plan. Ms. Mohr also noted that Task 2 is based on input from the previous stakeholders meeting, and therefore incorporates and addresses each of the four regional priorities determined by stakeholders.
- The following is an overview of the discussion regarding the draft work plan and approximate levels of effort:
 - Concern that if the Region only commits 40% to the regional water resources plans, there will not be enough effort to get done what is required.
 - Ultimately the Region is interested in winning a planning grant to support the region in managing their water supply, and wants to put forward the necessary effort to win.
 - There is room in the future to add in additional money, and complete additional studies. For now the Region is restricted by DWR standards for planning grants, and so should do what it takes to meet DWR standards.

- Question regarding the meetings. Is the work plan doubling up on meetings? What is the difference between meetings listed in Task 1 and meetings listed in Task 3?
 - The meetings in Task 1 include general meetings that the Region will use in their overall stakeholder outreach. This includes public meetings that will be used to discuss the IRWM Plan. Meetings in Task 3 should be edited to show that these are directed workgroups, which will be used to produce deliverables for the IRWM Plan.
- With regards to the climate change task (Task 2-3), what data will be used? Climate change is very speculative, is there any region-specific work available?
 - Task 2-3 work will be conducted in compliance with stringent DWR standards relating to climate change. This task will include using existing modeling software and data to determine region-specific climate change vulnerabilities, rank vulnerabilities, and provide potential strategies to address the vulnerabilities.
 - In addition, DWR specifies that regions may look at “no-regret” strategies, meaning climate change strategies that make sense for the region to complete regardless of potential climate change impacts. Task 2-3 will be sure to include no-regret climate change adaptation strategies.
 - The United States Bureau of Reclamation Study includes information regarding climate change, which will be used in development of Task 2-3.
- Looking back to the issue of the schedule, is there any chance that the Round 3 Implementation Grant funding will not be available? Is the Region risking putting all of its eggs in one basket?
 - Anna Aljabiry noted that the funding for IRWM is obligated as part of the water bond. For now DWR anticipates that between \$360 and \$390 million will be available in Round 3.
 - DWR anticipates allowing regions to complete a two-phased process for Round 2 Implementation Funding. The first phase will occur in late 2012, and the second will be six months after. Therefore, the Region may potentially have until approximately the late spring/early summer of 2013 to develop an IRWM Plan.
 - The Region could carry on without a consultant until DWR announces planning grant application awards. This would allow the Region to move forward with monthly meetings and stakeholder outreach such that they could be eligible for Round 2 Implementation Grant funding.
 - *RMC to alter schedule to show that the Region will carry on development of the IRWM Plan so that it may have the option to participate in Round 2 of Implementation Grant funding.*

Next Steps

- Jerry noted that the next meeting is scheduled for December 13th, 2011 and will take place from 1-3 p.m.

- Tish Berge wrapped up the meeting by providing an overview of action items:
 - *Add Tulvio Durand to stakeholder e-mail list.*
 - *Anthony Barry to send Jerry Rolwing scope for County flood study once it is ready. County flood control efforts within the ABD Region will remain a standing item on the agenda.*
 - *Anthony Barry and Jerry Rolwing to talk at a separate time regarding the flood study.*
 - *Tish Berge to send a copy of the PowerPoint presentation for this meeting to Dale Schafer.*
 - *Dale Schafer to send an overview of stakeholder outreach efforts to RMC.*
 - *Jerry Rolwing to provide Anna Aljabiry's email address to Rosa Reagles.*
 - *Tish Berge to provide stakeholders with DWR email address so that they can sign-up for the stakeholder email list.*
 - *Work Plan Workgroup to receive budget, schedule, and work plan prior to next meeting. The group will provide comments via email, and will reconvene another conference call if necessary.*



RMC Water and Environment
 2001 N. Main St., Suite 400
 Walnut Creek, CA 94596
 (925) 627-4100

November 17, 2011
 Project No: 0542-001.00
 Invoice No: 13478

Jerry Rowling
 806 Palm Canyon Drive
 P.O. Box 1870
 Borrego Springs, CA 92004

Project 0542-001.00 Borrego Water District - IRWM Planning Grant Application - Round 2
Professional Engineering Services from October 01, 2011 to October 28, 2011

Task		01	Meetings/Workshops		
Labor					
			Hours	Rate	Amount
Sr Project Manager II	Berge, Tish		14.75	220.00	3,245.00
Project Planner I	Mohr, Crystal		13.00	155.00	2,015.00
	Totals		27.75		5,260.00
	Total Labor				5,260.00
Reimbursables					
Reimbursable Meals					
9/20/2011	Berge, Tish	Meal at Carlee's Place			40.00
	Total Reimbursables		1.1 times	40.00	44.00
				Total this Task	\$5,304.00

Task		02	Prepare Planning Grant-Round 2 Proposal		
Labor					
			Hours	Rate	Amount
Sr Project Manager II	Berge, Tish		1.50	220.00	330.00
Project Planner I	Mohr, Crystal		9.75	155.00	1,511.25
Administrator	Parkison, Heather		.50	95.00	47.50
	Totals		11.75		1,888.75
	Total Labor				1,888.75
				Total this Task	\$1,888.75

Billing Limits	Current Billing	Prior Billing	To-Date Billing
Total Billings	7,192.75	13,375.29	20,568.04
Contract Amount			47,462.00
Budget Remaining			26,893.96

Total this Invoice	\$7,192.75
---------------------------	-------------------

Outstanding Invoices

Number	Date	Balance
13376	10/28/2011	9,120.29

Progress Report



Borrego Water District –IRWM Planning Grant –Round 2

Subject: Progress Report

Prepared for: Jerry Rolwing, General Manager, Borrego Water District

Prepared by: Tish Berge, Project Manager

Date: November 17, 2011

RMC Project No.: 0542-001.00

This progress report summarizes the work performed and project status from October 1, 2011 to October 28, 2011 for the IRWM Planning Grant – Round 2. The progress report outline is as follows:

- Work Performed
- Budget Status
- Schedule Status
- Other

1 Work Performed

The following tasks were completed during this reporting period:

- Task 1: Outreach and Coordination (Remaining scope has: 2 RWMG Meetings and 1 Stakeholder/DAC/tribal Workshops)
 - Conducted Stakeholder Meeting on 10/11/2011, including agenda, presentation, and meeting minutes prep
 - Conducted RWMG/Work Plan Workgroup Meeting on 10/25/2011, including agenda and draft outline
- Task 2: Prepare Planning Grant-Round 2 Proposal
 - Coordination with CCP (Dale Schafer) and Wrieme/RMC (Ali Taghavi) with regard to DWR's facilitation and technical support of ABD IRWM
 - Review draft PSP
 - Prepare work plan outline based on stakeholder feedback

Work planned for the next reporting period:

- Task 1: Meetings/Workshops
 - Stakeholder Meeting – 11//8/2011
 - Work Plan Workgroup Meeting – 11/2//2011

- Task 2: Prepare Planning Grant-Round 2 Proposal
 - Prepare draft work plan/budget/schedule for review by stakeholders in December

2 Budget Status

The total budget for this project is \$47,462. Please see the attached worksheet for detail.

3 Schedule Status

Work is progressing on schedule.

4 Other

The RMC scope of work had several assumptions that need to be revisited:

- Meeting assumptions were 5 RWMG Meetings [3 via conf call] and 3 Stakeholder/DAC/tribal Workshops. With the November stakeholder meeting and the Work Plan Workgroup conference calls in October, we will run out of meeting budget. We have provided cost estimates for future meetings and discussed the possibility of holding the meetings via conference call or webinar. Need direction on how to proceed with regard to meetings planned for December and January and any other conference calls/workgroups.
- Tribal outreach assumption was that we were going to use Daniel Cozad for tribal outreach. We have agreed that this effort will not be needed, and propose using the funds to offset meeting costs.
- The overall budget was based on DWR's funding of technical and facilitation assistance, which has been delayed.

Application for Payment Invoice
 IRWM Planning Grant - Round 2
 Borrego Water District

OWNER
 Borrego Water District
 806 Palm Canyon Drive
 Borrego Springs, CA 92004

BILLING SUMMARY
 From Date: 10/1/2011
 To Date: 10/28/2011

ATTENTION
 Jerry Rolwing, General Manager

FROM
 Tish Berge, Project Manager

Task No.	Description	BUDGETED AMOUNT	DUE THIS BILLING	AMOUNT PREVIOUSLY SPENT	AMOUNT BILLED TO DATE	FUNDS REMAINING	PERCENT EXPENDED
1	Planning Grant-Round 2 Proposal	\$ 47,462.00	\$ 7,192.75	\$ 13,375.29	\$ 20,568.04	\$ 26,893.96	43%
	Total	\$ 47,462.00	\$ 7,192.75	\$ 13,375.29	\$ 20,568.04	\$ 26,893.96	43%

BLANK PAGE



BORREGO WATER DISTRICT

November 2011

WATER OPERATIONS REPORT

<u>WELL</u>	<u>TYPE</u>	<u>FLOW RATE</u>	<u>STATUS</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
ID1-1	Irrigation	150	Standby	Backup well for Rams Hill Golf Course
ID1-2	Irrigation	150	Standby	Backup well for Rams Hill Golf Course
ID1-8	Production	350	In Use	
ID1-10	Production	300	In Use	
ID1-12	Production	950	In Use	
ID1-16	Production	950	In Use	
Wilcox	Production	150	In Use	Diesel backup well for ID-4
ID4-4	Production	350	In Use	
ID4-10	Production	80	In Use	
ID4-11	Production	1000	In Use	Diesel engine drive exercised monthly
ID4-18	Production	250	In Use	
ID5-5	Production	900	In Use	Diesel engine drive exercised monthly

System Problems: SCADA radio problems

WASTEWATER OPERATIONS REPORT

Rams Hill Water Reclamation Plant serving ID-1, ID-2 and ID-5 Total Cap. 0.25 MGD (million gallons per day):

Average flow: 73,500 (gallons per day)

Peak flow: 99,336 gpd Monday November 28th

All restaurant grease traps were clean.

System Problems: None.

**WATER PRODUCTION SUMMARY
November 2011**

DATE	ID-1	ID-3	ID-4	ID-5	DISTRICT-WIDE TOTALS
Nov '10	138.01	11.14	100.44	16.60	266.19
----	----	----	----	----	----
Dec '10	103.41	11.68	130.03	10.98	256.10
Jan '11	39.57	8.20	73.97	5.16	126.90
Feb '11	74.16	9.36	109.79	8.68	201.99
Mar '11	58.56	7.87	93.55	8.57	168.55
Apr '11	109.04	11.86	111.39	16.08	248.37
May '11	107.04	13.94	137.00	21.15	279.13
Jun '11	70.10	14.25	123.58	17.21	225.14
Jul '11	70.51	15.94	136.64	17.81	240.90
Aug '11	56.10	16.67	165.82	22.17	260.76
Sep '11	39.01	15.88	131.35	14.81	201.05
Oct '11	34.11	13.61	143.26	20.58	211.56
Nov '11	30.48	11.67	130.27	11.60	184.02
12 Mo. TOTAL	792.09	150.93	1486.65	174.80	2604.47

Totals reflect individual improvement district usage. Interties from ID-3 and ID-5 have been subtracted from well pumpage totals and applied to respective ID's. All figures in Acre Feet of water pumped or recorded on intertie meters.

WATER LOSS SUMMARY (%)

DATE	ID-1	ID-3	ID-4	ID-5	DISTRICT-WIDE AVERAGE
Nov '11	5.04	6.34	14.32	N/A	8.57
12 Mo. Average	2.20	1.45	11.61	N/A	5.09

BORREGO WATER DISTRICT
 Water Production / Use Records
 ID # 1
 Month of November 2011

----- Water Production (Acre Feet) -----								
Date	Well 1	Well 2	Well 8	Well 10	Well 12	Well 16	Total	LessID3&4
=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
NOV'10	10.53	12.70	16.83	14.81	43.96	50.32	149.15	138.45
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
DEC'10	0.00	0.00	0.00	21.85	33.05	60.19	115.09	103.47
JAN'11	0.93	1.18	0.00	21.04	22.62	2.00	47.77	39.61
FEB'11	0.00	0.00	0.00	14.73	39.51	29.28	83.52	74.20
MAR'11	0.00	0.00	0.16	10.67	26.97	28.63	66.43	58.59
APR'11	0.00	0.00	0.00	37.56	32.95	50.39	120.90	109.04
MAY'11	0.00	0.00	0.18	20.87	52.92	47.01	120.98	107.04
JUN'11	0.00	0.00	0.19	8.14	41.35	34.67	84.35	70.10
JUL'11	0.00	0.00	0.07	11.42	35.99	38.97	86.45	70.47
AUG'11	0.00	0.00	1.59	3.85	41.01	26.32	72.77	56.10
SEP'11	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	38.01	16.88	54.89	39.01
OCT'11	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.52	33.18	10.02	47.72	34.11
NOV'11	0.00	0.00	0.00	11.98	30.17	0.00	42.15	30.48
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
TOTALS	0.93	1.18	2.19	166.63	427.73	344.36	943.02	792.22
=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====

----- Water Use (Acre Feet) -----									
Date	Domestic	Irrigat'n	Constrt'n	Golf			Total	Water	
				Course	ID 3	ID 4		Loss	% Loss
=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
NOV'10	12.11	14.23	0.00	108.88	10.70	0.00	145.92	3.23	2.17%
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
DEC'10	11.79	14.14	0.00	76.70	11.62	0.00	114.25	0.84	0.74%
JAN'11	6.89	6.46	0.00	24.30	8.16	0.00	45.81	1.96	4.11%
FEB'11	8.99	12.35	0.00	51.33	9.32	0.00	81.99	1.53	1.82%
MAR'11	7.66	7.49	0.00	42.24	7.84	0.00	65.23	1.20	1.79%
APR'11	11.42	12.69	0.00	84.16	11.86	0.00	120.13	0.77	0.64%
MAY'11	12.25	15.56	0.00	78.08	13.94	0.00	119.83	1.15	0.95%
JUN'11	11.78	14.75	0.00	41.15	14.25	0.00	81.93	2.42	2.88%
JUL'11	14.71	16.18	0.00	39.19	15.98	0.00	86.06	0.39	0.46%
AUG'11	13.40	21.35	0.00	16.10	16.67	0.00	67.52	5.25	7.21%
SEP'11	12.93	23.54	0.00	0.00	15.88	0.00	52.35	2.54	4.61%
OCT'11	10.56	22.98	0.00	0.00	13.61	0.00	47.15	0.57	1.17%
NOV'11	10.61	17.75	0.00	0.00	11.67	0.00	40.03	2.12	5.04%
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
TOTALS	132.99	185.24	0.00	453.25	150.80	0.00	922.28	20.74	2.20%
=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====

BORREGO WATER DISTRICT
 Water Production / Use Records
 ID # 3
 Month of November 2011

Date	La Casa del Zorro Total Acre Feet		Deep Well Trail / Others Acre Feet			Total Irrigat'n	Total Domestic	Total Acre Feet
	Irrigat'n	Domestic	Irrigat'n	Domestic	Total			
NOV'10	0.00	0.69	1.02	8.91	9.93	1.02	9.60	10.62
DEC'10	0.00	0.71	1.93	8.82	10.75	1.93	9.53	11.46
JAN'11	0.00	0.67	0.66	6.70	7.36	0.66	7.37	8.03
FEB'11	0.00	0.65	0.57	8.03	8.60	0.57	8.68	9.25
MAR'11	0.00	0.61	0.45	6.79	7.24	0.45	7.40	7.85
APR'11	0.00	0.69	0.66	10.40	11.06	0.66	11.09	11.75
MAY'11	0.00	0.72	1.29	11.96	13.25	1.29	12.68	13.97
JUN'11	0.00	0.68	1.66	11.66	13.32	1.66	12.34	14.00
JUL'11	0.00	0.65	1.60	13.63	15.23	1.60	14.28	15.88
AUG'11	0.00	0.69	2.45	13.31	15.76	2.45	14.00	16.45
SEP'11	0.00	0.69	1.44	13.48	14.92	1.44	14.17	15.61
OCT'11	0.00	0.72	1.35	11.36	12.71	1.35	12.08	13.43
NOV'11	0.00	0.67	1.09	9.17	10.26	1.09	9.84	10.93
TOTALS	0.00	8.15	15.15	125.31	140.46	15.15	133.46	148.61

Date	Water Produced Acre Feet	Water Delivered Acre Feet	Wtr Loss	% Loss
NOV'10	10.69	10.62	0.07	0.65%
DEC'10	11.62	11.46	0.16	1.38%
JAN'11	8.16	8.03	0.13	1.59%
FEB'11	9.32	9.25	0.07	0.75%
MAR'11	7.84	7.85	- .01	- .13%
APR'11	11.86	11.75	0.11	0.93%
MAY'11	13.94	13.97	- .03	- .22%
JUN'11	14.25	14.00	0.25	1.75%
JUL'11	15.98	15.88	0.10	0.63%
AUG'11	16.67	16.45	0.22	1.32%
SEP'11	15.88	15.61	0.27	1.70%
OCT'11	13.61	13.43	0.18	1.32%
NOV'11	11.67	10.93	0.74	6.34%
TOTALS	150.80	148.61	2.19	1.45%

BORREGO WATER DISTRICT
 Water Production / Use Records
 ID # 4
 Month of November 2011

----- Water Production (Acre Feet) -----											
Date	Well 2	Well 3	Well 4	Well 5	Well 10	Well 11	Well 18	Wilcox	Well 85	Total	Less ID5
=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
NOV'10	0.00	0.00	53.64	23.36	0.00	36.08	3.56	0.40	0.00	117.04	100.44
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
DEC'10	0.00	0.00	63.71	13.91	23.03	29.06	4.59	0.06	0.00	134.36	123.38
JAN'11	0.00	0.00	4.11	5.74	10.47	56.25	2.56	0.00	0.00	79.13	73.97
FEB'11	0.00	0.00	59.61	13.52	12.22	25.75	7.37	0.00	0.00	118.47	109.79
MAR'11	0.00	0.00	52.95	12.56	9.76	23.31	3.54	0.00	0.00	102.12	93.55
APR'11	0.00	0.00	55.03	17.90	10.56	39.41	4.44	0.13	0.00	127.47	111.39
MAY'11	0.00	0.00	61.63	26.75	12.22	49.97	7.46	0.12	0.00	158.15	137.00
JUN'11	0.00	0.00	52.61	23.50	10.02	49.34	5.10	0.22	0.00	140.79	123.58
JUL'11	0.00	0.00	44.98	23.97	10.17	69.69	5.05	0.59	0.00	154.45	136.64
AUG'11	0.00	0.00	57.82	31.32	11.85	79.87	6.34	0.79	0.00	187.99	165.82
SEP'11	0.00	0.00	50.27	23.27	9.38	58.06	4.92	0.26	0.00	146.16	131.35
OCT'11	0.00	0.00	55.29	25.88	10.53	67.11	5.03	0.00	0.00	163.84	143.26
NOV'11	0.00	0.00	40.36	16.18	11.47	69.54	4.30	0.02	0.00	141.87	130.27
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
TOTALS	0.00	0.00	598.37	234.50	141.68	617.36	60.70	2.19	0.00	1654.80	1480.00
=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====

Date	Water Produced Acre Feet	Water Use Acre Feet	Wtr Loss	% Loss	ID 5 Acre Feet
=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
NOV'10	117.04	112.10	4.94	4.22%	16.60
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
DEC'10	134.36	105.42	28.94	21.54%	10.98
JAN'11	79.13	78.23	0.90	1.14%	5.16
FEB'11	118.47	97.28	21.19	17.89%	8.68
MAR'11	102.12	87.19	14.93	14.62%	8.57
APR'11	127.47	117.51	9.96	7.81%	16.08
MAY'11	158.15	142.96	15.19	9.60%	21.15
JUN'11	140.79	127.47	13.32	9.46%	17.21
JUL'11	154.45	136.19	18.26	11.82%	17.81
AUG'11	187.99	169.17	18.82	10.01%	22.17
SEP'11	146.16	132.34	13.82	9.46%	14.81
OCT'11	163.84	147.41	16.43	10.03%	20.58
NOV'11	141.87	121.56	20.31	14.32%	11.60
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
TOTALS	1654.80	1462.73	192.07	11.61%	174.80
=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====

BLANK PAGE

BWD HOLIDAYS	
New Years Day	Mon - 01/02
Martin Luther King Day	Mon - 01/16
Presidents' Day	Mon - 02/20
Cesar Chavez Day	Fri - 03/30
Memorial Day	Mon - 05/28
Independence Day	Wed - 07/04
Labor Day	Mon - 09/03
Veterans Day	Mon - 11/12
Thanksgiving	11/22 & 11/23
Christmas	Tues - 12/25