



importing water must be part of the solution in order to stabilize the basin, along with the water demand control features being implemented by the District. He also suggested including an explanation of the process in the Plan, with an example. The ratepayers want to know why a study is needed and how its success will be measured. Rich Williamson pointed out that our ultimate goal is to gain additional water, and we need to weigh economic considerations and other factors using a multi-pronged approach.

Discussion followed regarding the possibility of compiling investigative data in a single document for use in various funding applications, but Mr. Williamson explained that different agencies require different types of information. He went on to emphasize the importance of BWD's tiered rates and conservation program, showing that we had programs in place to help ourselves before seeking financial assistance. Mr. Williamson was happy to report that BWD has been selected as one of six basins nationwide for a Bureau of Reclamation study. A 50 percent match is required, which may be provided in in-kind services.

Mr. Mills invited the Subcommittee's attention to Table 6-1 of the Plan, showing Tier 1 short term projects and objectives. Bob Calhoun recommended that Canebrake's water system improvements be listed as meeting the objective to reduce water demand. He further pointed out that Table 6-2, showing prioritized projects and benefits, listed Canebrake's hydrogeologic study as a "priority 2" and their water system improvements as "priority 1." He explained that the study must be performed before the improvements are made.

Mr. Mills explained the direct and indirect benefits available to Disadvantaged Communities (DACs). Borrego Springs and Jacumba have been so designated. Discussion followed regarding the fact that Canebrake had not been designated, and Mr. Calhoun felt their average income level had been determined as higher than it is. Mr. Rolwing noted that Cindy Elliott of RCAC had offered reconsideration. Mr. Mills requested a copy of Canebrake's grant application, which was declined due to the alleged high income level.

Discussion followed regarding environmental concerns associated with the declining aquifer's impact on the State Park, and consequences of taking no action or inadequate action. Mr. Williamson emphasized the importance of including this issue in the IRWMP, and Mr. Mills agreed to add it.

Mr. Calhoun questioned the potential contamination risks as the aquifer is drawn down and we need to use "old" water, the quality of which is unknown. This could be another factor in support of our grant application. In any event, the water will need to be treated.

Mr. Mills requested the Subcommittee's input on the project prioritization process, hoping to reach a consensus. Lyle Brecht reiterated his recommendation that the process be described in greater detail pursuant to the guidelines, and his concern that decisions were made by the Policy Committee rather than the Stakeholders. For example, he cited the targets set forth on page 32 of the draft Plan for reduction of agricultural water use by specified levels every two years. Did the agricultural Stakeholders agree to these figures, and will the Subcommittee help them achieve the targets? Mr. Williamson explained that he had arrived at the targets based on groundwater studies, conversations and meetings that supported them as being realistic. Lyle Brecht urged further discussion of the matter, and Mr. Williamson assured him that all aspects of the draft Plan were open to discussion. It won't be finalized until next spring. Further discussion was continued to the next meeting, and Lyle Brecht was requested to forward his concerns to the other Stakeholders.

4. Review Grant Application Process and Scoring Standards

Mr. Mills invited the Subcommittee's attention to the Grant Application Process and Scoring Standards, which included background information, work plan contents, budget and schedule as well as scoring criteria and standards. Mr. Rolwing noted that this is a work in progress, which will be updated based on statewide priorities and guidelines. We hope for a decision on the planning grant application by the end of this year.

5. Other

In response to a suggestion that the State Park be included on the Policy Committee, Mr. Mills explained that they do not qualify as a "local agency."

6. Next Subcommittee meeting

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:15 a.m. The next meeting of the IRWM Stakeholders Subcommittee will be held on October 26, 2010, at 9:00 a.m. at the Borrego Water District.