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 Montesoro 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 is 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.*