

Anza Borrego Desert Planning Region Integrated Regional Water Management Plan

Tuesday December 13, 2011
1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

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

Remote Access:

Webinar access - <https://www2.gotomeeting.com/join/911608090>
Conference line – call-in number 1-888-870-8306, passcode 9256274132

DRAFT NOTES

Action items are shown in italics

Attendees:

Jerry Rolwing, BWD
Lyle Brecht, BWD
Beth Hart, BWD
Anna Aljabiry, DWR
Ray Shindler, Resident
Dan Leidecker, Resident
Linda Haddock, Borrego Springs
Chamber of Commerce
Jane Morley, Resident
Jim Engelke, Resident
Conrad Kramer, Anza-Borrego
Foundation
Jim Wermers, De Anza Country Club
Kathy Dice, Anza-Borrego Desert
State Park
Tish Berge, RMC
Crystal Mohr, RMC

Attending by Phone

Brian Moniz, DWR
Dale Schafer, Center for
Collaborative Policy
Pam Nelson, Elsinore-
Murrieta-Anza Resource
Conservation District
(EMARCD)
Vicki Long, EMARCD
Anthony Barry, County of
San Diego Flood Control

Non-Participating Observers

Marshal Brecht,
BWD
Ray Delahay, BWD

Agenda:

Welcome and Introductions

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

Review Outcomes of Last Meeting, November 8, 2011

- Jerry Rolwing provided an overview of the previous Anza Borrego Desert (ABD) stakeholders meeting, which took place on November 8, 2011. He noted that during this meeting, stakeholders reviewed and commented on the Draft Work Plan for the ABD Planning Grant application.

- Tish Berge also noted that the notes from the previous meeting are available for comments, and inquired if anyone has edits or changes to make at this time. There were no comments.
- Mr. Rolwing added that the previous day (December 12, 2011) members of the Regional Water Management Group (RWMG) [which includes the Borrego Water District (BWD), San Diego County, and the Resource Conservation District of Greater San Diego County (RCD)] had a meeting via teleconference to discuss IRWM planning in the ABD Region. He noted that in attendance at the meeting were: Marty Leavitt from ~~the County of San Diego~~RCD, Jerry Rolwing and Lyle Brecht from BWD, and Tish Berge from RMC. During this meeting, the RWMG discussed the direction of the ABD IRWM Program, and agreed that the RWMG agencies are comfortable with the current direction of the program. Marty Leavitt agreed to explore inter-regional cooperation with nearby regions, especially with San Diego's IRWMP process. Jerry Rolwing agreed to ask Jim Bennett for text to include in the proposal about the County's participation in the RWMG. Marty Leavitt agreed to provide some text concerning RCD for the grant proposal^[LB1].

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. There were no additions or questions.

DWR Report

- Anna Aljabiry provided an overview of DWR updates. Ms. Aljabiry noted that DWR is currently holding Process Improvement Workshops throughout the State, and will be holding a workshop in Sacramento on December 20, 2011, which will be broadcasted over a webcast.
- Ms. Aljabiry then provided an overview of upcoming deadlines and grant submittals. She noted that the Local Groundwater Assistance (LGA) grant opportunity is currently underway, and a final Guidelines and Proposal Solicitation Package will likely be released in January 2012. Ms. Aljabiry noted that in order to apply for this grant, applicants do not need to be within an IRWM Region, and that grants will be provided up to \$250,000. Ms. Aljabiry noted that the Proposition 1E Stormwater Flood Management Grants (Round 2) will likely be due in the Summer of 2012, and that the Proposition 84 Implementation Grants (Round 2) will likely be due in the Fall of 2012. With regards to the Implementation Grants, Ms. Aljabiry stated that this round will occur in two stages. The first stage (Step 1) will begin in Fall 2012, and applicants will be asked to submit a scope of work to DWR. DWR will then ask certain applicants to submit full applications (Step 2) in the Spring of 2013. DWR is looking into conducting Step 1 as an interview similar to the Region Acceptance Process (RAP) interview process.
- The following is a summary of questions and answers relating to Ms. Aljabiry's DWR Report. Please note that questions pertaining to the State of the Basin Report were answered by Brian Moniz of DWR:
 - Question: For Proposition 84 Implementation Grants, will DWR be eliminating some applicants after Step 1?
 - Answer: Yes. It is anticipated that not all applicants will be asked to submit full applications for Step 2.

- Question: If we already have a scope ready for a project should we sit down with the consultant team and discuss the project?
 - Answer: The ABD Region does not yet have a governance structure in place to determine the project selection process for grant cycles. That process will come at a later date, and is not appropriate at this time.
- Question: Regarding the governance issue, is it going to impact the ABD Region's Planning Grant Application because we do not have a governance structure in place at this time?
 - Answer: DWR is very concerned with Governance, and it is up to the Region in their grant application to make a case to reviewers (which will be three independent reviewers) that the Region is working towards establishing a legitimate governance structure. DWR does want to see how the Region's structure will allow it to effectively handle funds, and this should be a part of the Planning Grant Application. Make sure that the Planning Grant application identifies stakeholder outreach that is going on right now, and describe how this process informs the scope of work (Work Plan_{LB2}).
- Comment: In order for the Region to establish a legitimate governance process it is going to take time. The Region has a plan, and although it is not complete at this time, work is being done towards developing a charter and other necessary governance documents.
- Question: There is concern about who is going to handle the "nuts and bolts" of the work proposed in the Planning Grant Application.
 - Answer: Demonstrate this in the Planning Grant Application: show the milestones that will take place and the timeline. Also show who is going to complete the work.
- Question: The current budget shows a consultant doing most of the work. Current DWR standards require a competitive bid process for consultants, so we do not know who will be completing the work. Is that correct?
 - Answer: DWR does currently require a competitive process for consultant selection, but DWR does not need to see the documents as part of any submittals. These would only need to be provided in the event of an audit.
- Question: Regarding the Proposition 84 Implementation Grant (Round 2), at what point does the Region need to have an adopted IRWM Plan? Does DWR have a specific scope for what kind of projects should be submitted? Are there boundaries?
 - Answer: The IRWM Plan will need to be complete at the actual application process (Step 2), which is currently expected to occur in Spring of 2013. There are boundaries for the Implementation Grant submittal, which DWR will release as a PSP (similar to the Planning Grants).
- Question: Regarding contracting for the grants, can you speak to this and issues associated with contracting?
 - Answer: Many regions have experienced delays in receiving payment throughout the grant process. While DWR requires

submittal of invoices on a quarterly basis, we recommend submitting on a monthly basis for a faster turnaround. Unfortunately to date DWR has not been able to resolve issues relating to turn around times for payments; however we are working to improve the process.

- Question: We are very concerned as a small agency with limited cash flow that this will be a serious issue in paying contractors. Does DWR offer bridge loans to help with this? Does DWR ever pay regions up front?
 - Answer: We really recommend that you invoice monthly. At this time DWR does not offer loan programs, and cannot provide the money upfront.
- Question: Regarding the State of the Basin Report, which is anticipated to be completed under a DWR Technical Assistance Contract, what is the status?
 - Answer: DWR currently anticipates two separate reports being produced. The first is what we are referring to as the State of the Basin Report, which will focus on the Borrego Valley. This report will look at all studies done throughout the Borrego Valley Groundwater Basin (BVGB) that show current knowledge of the basin. The purpose will be to summarize this information into a document that is easily understandable to all stakeholders. The second report will look at the entire ABD IRWM Region and the status of groundwater basins throughout the Region. The second report will be important for IRWM planning purposes to pull the Region together and present issues that the Region faces as a whole.
- Question: Who is “we?” Who will be doing this work?
 - Answer: DWR Southern Region Office will be managing and completing these reports.
- Question: We are concerned about this. Ali Taghavi who previously worked with the group has met Regional stakeholders, and has trust with them as a neutral party and as somebody who has the ability to convey technical information in an understandable manner. We would really like him to still be involved in development of these documents. We are also concerned about stakeholder input, will stakeholders have a say in the development of these documents?
 - Answer: DWR will be working with Ali Taghavi and stakeholders. In addition, this report is not making conclusions. The idea is to characterize the basin and the overdraft issue without conclusions. DWR will work with stakeholders to develop conclusions. The solutions and other issues will come later and be up to the Region.
- Question: Concern about only using existing information. USGS is currently working on robust modeling, and working to dramatically update existing data. We are concerned that the report will not contain this information.
 - Answer: The intent is to capture all available information. USGS and DWR are currently working together, and USGS is using information from DWR in their modeling. DWR has every intention of incorporating USGS work into the study.

- Question: This is the first we have heard of the regional groundwater study. Can we please have the scope of both of DWR's anticipated reports to include within the Planning Grant Application?
 - Answer: DWR is currently working to finalize these.
 - *Tish Berge and Brian Moniz to talk separately about incorporating DWR's work into the Planning Grant Application.*
- Question: When will the Final PSP for the Planning Grant be ready?
 - Answer: *Anna Aljabiry will send final dates, including the final due date and the assumed grant contract date to Tish Berge by Monday, December 19, 2011. Brian Moniz to send DWR's preliminary schedule to Jerry Rolwing.*

Discussion of Feasibility and Technical Support Assessment

- Please note that the Technical "State of the Basin Report" was discussed in the preceding section under the DWR Report topic.
- Dale Schafer provided an overview of the Feasibility Assessment regarding Facilitation and Technical Support for the Region. Dale inquired if the stakeholders have all received her draft report.
 - *Jerry Rolwing to make sure that stakeholders have received the report, and will send it out to the group if they have not.*
- Ms. Schafer explained that the purpose of the report was to see if facilitation services for the Region's IRWM Program would be feasible through conducting interviews with stakeholders. In addition, the interviews included technical questions in order to determine the Region's major issues.
- Ms. Schafer also explained that she attempted to get a representation of different views, including golf course and agricultural perspectives. Ms. Schafer noted that she knows the report does not cover every issue or every perspective within the Region, but represents a good faith effort to encompass a variety of viewpoints.
- Ms. Schafer noted that she took what was heard in the interviews and defined conflicts within the Region. Ms. Schafer found that once stakeholders learned what the purpose of the IRWM Program is, they were open to the idea of participating.
- The following is a summary of questions and answers relating to Ms. Schafer's Feasibility Assessment:
 - Question: Any mention of tribes within the document? DWR is increasing efforts relating to tribal communities.
 - Answer: The report does not include tribes, as interviewers were unable to get a hold of tribal representatives. Jerry Rolwing noted that they have recently made contact with Shelter Island, and are continuing to reach out to other tribes and communities within the Region. He noted that Majestic Pines is potentially open to participating, but that Jacumba is in "great shape," and is not interested in participating. BWD has also recently reached out to the Superintendent of the Borrego Unified School District, and contacted over 25 people to participate in today's stakeholder meeting.

- Question: Does the RWMG need to get a formal statement from Jacumba and others about not wanting to participate in IRWM planning?
 - Answer: Not necessarily, but DWR would like to speak to Jacumba representatives for the Regional Report relating to the Region's groundwater basins. We should note in the Regional Report that Jacumba receives other means of funding due to their status as a Colonia.
- Question: What is the current status of governance and outreach efforts?
 - Answer: DWR has approved Phase II of the work, which will include 5-6 additional meetings. These meetings are anticipated to begin after submittal of the Planning Grant application, and will include development of a charter and governance structure.

Planning Grant Draft Attachments

- Tish Berge provided an overview of this item. A PowerPoint presentation was available to all meeting attendees via GoTo Meeting.
- Ms. Berge noted that to date, RMC has prepared three full attachments: Attachment 3 (Work Plan), Attachment 4, (Budget), and Attachment 5 (Schedule). The Work Plan was previously submitted to stakeholders and the Work Plan Workgroup for review. In addition, the Work Plan Workgroup reviewed and provided comments on Attachments 3, 4, and 5.
- RMC is working on preparing the final attachments to the Planning Grant Application, and will need to coordinate with BWD to obtain final information.
 - Anna Aljabiry noted that in previous submittals the Program Preferences attachment was not robust enough, and that regions felt that by mentioning each preference they could receive credit. She noted that for the next round, applicants will need to describe in detail (approximately ½ a page) how the proposal meets each Program Preference.
 - A question was asked if Program Preferences regarding the Bay-Delta apply to the Region. Ms. Aljabiry noted that if certain Program Preferences are not applicable to the Region, the Region should note this fact in the application.
- Tish Berge provided an overview of the Project Solicitation Package, which are the guidelines for the Planning Grant Application. She provided an overview of the requirements for the Work Plan, Budget, and Schedule. Ms. Berge also provided an overview of IRWM Plans, which are often referred to as “umbrella documents.” Therefore, these plans generally contain a synthesis of existing plans within the Region, and do not have their own statutory authority.
- Tish Berge and Crystal Mohr then provided a detailed overview of the Work Plan, Budget, and Schedule. The following provides an overview of important messages:
 - All outreach in the Region constitutes outreach to disadvantaged communities (DACs), because almost the entire Region qualifies as a DAC.
 - The Region's governance process is not complete at this time, however the Region has established a preliminary governance structure^[LB3].
 - Updating the IRWM Plan will involve many stakeholder meetings and workgroup meetings (these are to produce actual work products or

deliverables). This fact respects the Region's desire to maintain an open and transparent stakeholder process.

- The technical work in the Work Plan (Task 2) was designed to address key regional issues of: water supply, water quality, flood control, and environmental integrity.
- Task 3 (Updating the ABD IRWM Plan) includes all work necessary to amend and update the existing IRWM Plan to meet DWR's 2010 Guidelines.
- The total proposed budget is for \$836,535, including approximately \$858,000 in matching funds from BWD. These matching funds are from the *Southeast California Regional Basin Study*. The use of matching funds needs to be approved of by stakeholders and the RWMG^[LB4].
- It is assumed that the Planning Grant will occur over a two-year timeframe from June 2012 to June 2014^[LB5]. This schedule only reflects work indicated within the Work Plan, and does not include other studies or efforts currently going on in the Region.
- The following is a summary of questions and answers relating to RMC's presentation of the Work Plan, Budget, and Schedule:
 - Question: What about stakeholders within Terwilliger (an overlay area between the ABD Region and another IRWM Region)? Will these stakeholders be included in the process?
 - Answer: Yes. The Plan will cover the entire Region, including overlay areas such as Terwilliger. In addition, Task 1-3 of the Work Plan includes outreach to other IRWM regions such as the Upper Santa Margarita Watershed.
 - Question: Is there consensus to use the *Southeast California Regional Basin Study* as matching funds?
 - Answer: ~~Yes.No~~^[LB6]. Stakeholders would also like to potentially include (somewhere in the Work Plan) a robust discussion of all of the existing groundwater study efforts (USGS, the Borrego Springs Pipeline Feasibility Study, etc.) in order to capture the big picture of groundwater efforts going on in the Region.
 - *RMC needs all information including the work plan, budget, and schedule, including detailed budget information for the Southeast California Regional Basin Study from BWD as soon as possible for incorporation into the Planning Grant Application.*
 - Question: The *Southeast California Regional Basin Study* also includes climate change components. Can we use the DWR Planning Grant to pay (at least in part) for that effort?
 - Answer: RMC will need to see what that study entails to determine if we can fit it into the Work Plan (potentially into Task 2-3, which addresses climate change).
 - Question: What about the list that we received entitled, *Questions Posed by Work Plan Workgroup for Discussion by Stakeholder Committee*?
 - Answer: That document provides an overview of questions posed by the Workgroup, with RMC responses in italics. There are many places where RMC needs direction from stakeholders regarding

questions. RMC would like to receive feedback from stakeholders before moving forward with addressing each comment.

- *Stakeholders to send comments on the Work Plan/Budget/Schedule and the Work Plan Workgroup Comments to Jerry Rolwing by December 20, 2011.*
- Question: Can we include a different schedule such as a PERT chart? I am concerned that there are so many moving parts that something will fall through the cracks. An overall schedule will help ensure that everything is effectively managed.
 - Answer: The current schedule only pertains to what will be included within the Planning Grant Application, which includes work within the Work Plan and not other efforts. If it is helpful, we can create a more robust chart for use by stakeholders^[LB7].

Next Steps

- Tish Berge provided an overview of action items from the meeting, including:
 - *Tish Berge to connect with Brian Moniz (DWR) to discuss the State of the Basin Report and the Region Report.*
 - *Anna Aljabiry to send the group final dates for the Planning Grant Application by Monday, December 19.*
 - *Jerry to send the timeline document from DWR to the group.*
 - *Jerry to check that Dale Schafer's Feasibility Report was sent to stakeholders.*
 - *Stakeholders to provide comments on all draft attachments (3, 4, and 5) and the Work Plan Workgroup comments to Jerry Rolwing by December 20, 2011.*
 - *Tish Berge to connect with Jerry Rolwing to discuss details of the Southeast California Regional Basin Study.*
 - *RMC to ensure that a discussion of flood control is on the agenda for next meeting.*
- Tish Berge noted that there is one final scheduled stakeholder meeting, which is currently scheduled for January 10, 2012 from 1-3 p.m.
 - Stakeholders decided to use this final meeting to determine if further meetings are necessary.
- Tish Berge then inquired if there are any final comments from the stakeholder group. The following is a summary of comments:
 - Stakeholders need more than a few days to review documents.
 - There have been issues with the stakeholder email list, and some stakeholders were not notified of the previous meeting.
 - Stakeholders would like to see flood control as a standing item on the agenda. This item was not included on the agenda for today or discussed at today's meeting.
 - Dale Schafer can potentially begin facilitating meetings in February 2012 to ensure that stakeholder meetings continue after finalization of the Planning Grant Application.

