

BWC Meeting Notes

Welcome

- The acting facilitator opened the meeting, and reviewed agenda items:
 - Review of ongoing action items
 - Discuss updating baseline numbers for policy review, and importance/value of accurate numbers for agricultural water return flow
 - Review and discuss GSP structural options
 - Review and discuss feedback from BWD and San Diego County regarding letter sent from BWC in February

Review of Existing Action Items

1. **IN PROGRESS - Member** to continue public input sessions. The District Board has declined the BWC's request to publish recommendations in Borrego Sun.
2. **IN PROGRESS - Member** to report on Neighborhood Reinvestment Program Application. Member following up offline.
3. **IN PROGRESS - Members** to follow up with Toni Atkins regarding County land use policies and potential funding sources for GSA/GSP development. **Member** reported that Atkins is willing to visit the Borrego Valley in the fall as part of an effort to get the state focused on issues of importance to Borrego.
4. **IN PROGRESS - Member** followed up with Laura Peters at DWR regarding facilitation funding and potential funding sources for GSA/GSP development via DWR. This is still pending. DAC priority funding may be an option. DWR likely won't have funding until the end of 2015. SWRCB may have funding opportunities coming out this month for wastewater and over the summer for drinking water.
5. **IN PROGRESS - Members** to reconcile baseline numbers in Policy Document by following up with USGS and agriculture.
6. **IN PROGRESS/DONE** - Determine cost for counsel to add language to legislation regarding cooperation between private and public agencies. (**Legal Workgroup** to determine if worthwhile to pursue, in parallel, while waiting for county response on BWC participation. Additionally, **Legal Workgroup** to consider discussing downside of not pursuing / waiting for County response on 501(c) formation).
7. **IN PROGRESS/DONE - Member** drafted language for an internal log of potential changes to policy recommendations. This was sent via email, and will be stored on the BWC Drop-box along with updated archives for past meetings.
8. **IN PROGRESS/DONE - Member** reviewed the current BWC website FAQ and made recommendations for updates. Member will follow up and update the website.

9. **IN PROGRESS - Member** will review the current BWC technical recommendations and make recommendations for updates to add to the log.
10. **DONE - Member** will draft letter to be sent from BWC to the county and the BWD, and will send to members for review.
11. **DONE - Member** to draft letter to BWD and county, send to all members to sign.
12. **DONE - Member** will distribute the town hall agenda to members for comment.

Baseline Numbers for Policy Review

- A member presented reference documents related to establishing baseline numbers for overdraft and pumping, noting locations where there is some variation between estimates and reported numbers. It was noted that it is not clear how return flow - the amount of water applied to the ground via irrigation that is not used by crops or lost to evapotranspiration, and therefore returns to the aquifer - has been calculated in the models used by the BWC to develop policy recommendations. Different methods of calculating return flow may impact the final calculation of the overdraft, and therefore also the percentage of water use that must be scaled back.
- Members agreed that, if there are assumptions made in the calculation of return flow, these assumptions should be articulated in the BWC's policy, particularly in reference to water availability, water quality, and economic impacts.
- **ACTION ITEM: Members** to write a letter to both the BWD and San Diego County asking for consultation and clarification regarding whether their models of the BVGB include return flow, and how return flow has been calculated. Responses to this letter will allow the BWC to adjust their use of models as needed.

GSP Structural Options

- A member presented reference slides summarizing different structural options for GSP implementation, with the goal of generating discussion on what to fund and how. Options presented include: adjudication, command and control, public finance, market based, doing nothing and waiting for the state.
- The presentation continued with a discussion of options for funding via fair proportional share, including division by: share of owned acreage, share of withdrawals, share of property values, share of water rights, or blended proportional share. The need for a solidly defensible public platform on which to build the GSP was emphasized.
- **ACTION ITEM - Member** to present this discussion to the BWD at the Special Board Meeting on 3/17, and suggest including it at the BWD Town Hall meeting on 3/25.

Letters from San Diego County and BWD

- A member distributed and presented letters from San Diego County and the BWD, which were written in response to the BWC's letter requesting feedback on how to facilitate involvement in the GSP process.

- Key points from the letters and discussion include:
 - The BWD and County note that GSPs must include stakeholder input. By representing 80% of water users, the BWC can help to fulfill this requirement as a stakeholder group.
 - San Diego County writes that they will confer internally regarding the structure of stakeholder outreach and potential inclusion of the BWC.
 - A member expressed concern that the BWC does not want to lose its voice because it's not an official GSA.
 - A member noted the difference between the BWC having a "seat at the table," and having a "peer to peer relationship" with other GSAs.
- Members consulted Jim Bennett (San Diego County) via conference call regarding structural options to participate in stakeholder engagement processes. Mr. Bennett discussed with members the value of having two GSAs in the BVGB to oversee both land use (San Diego County) and water use (BWD), and the BWC's need for assurances that their interests as stakeholders are protected and their input will be valued.
- **ACTION ITEM: Members** to work on the next evolution of response letters to the BWD and the County.
 - Members agreed that these response letters should work towards the goals of: 1) Resolving the BWC's role while the BWD and County are defining their functions and relationship as GSAs, so that the BWC could be involved in the process going forward; and 2) Establishing a way for the BWC to participate in the development and implementation of the GSP.
 - To meet these goals, members discussed 4 high priority components of a draft letter: 1) The BWC seeks assurances that its input will be valued; 2) The BWC needs protection for recommendations it makes to GSAs, and recourse for the promises GSAs make to it; 3) What assurances do the BWD and County need from the BWC to ensure that the BWC will continue to be a representative group of stakeholders? and 4) Is there anything the BWC ought to be doing in the meantime to accommodate how the GSA/GSP processes are likely to evolve?

Continued Discussion/Round Up

- A member requested clarification about how to "get credit" for work that's already been done to reduce water use. The District confirmed that the baseline is 2004, and documentation of reductions should include firm dates, what's been done, and the expected result.
- A member asked whether the BWD is still working with Dudek to come up with a water credits policy, and how to get credit for costs outside of buying land. The District clarified that there are tiers for water credits, and members should document if they're putting measures in place for their reduction plans.
- A member of the DAC group noted that their group has discussed a possible reduction of the agricultural labor force in town. Borrego might be able to get DAC funding from the state, but they would need to show engagement with DAC issues. One option is to ask DWR for funds for a facilitator who would also be a DAC coordinator. For example, a DAC program could be

Thursday, March 5, 2015

set up to educate gardeners on desert-friendly plants and taking out grass, and have the BWD certify and recommend gardeners who are trained to use less water.

- Members discussed ways to promote landscaping with native plants. A member suggested that the BWD could host a native plants demo plot, or a competition between local gardeners. A member described ABDNHA's demo garden and educational outreach. A member described BAI's Art Farm project.
- Members discussed concerns related to agricultural jobs in the Valley, and the potential need for better data about the economic impact of lost agricultural or landscaping jobs.

Attendance

Borrego Water District	Lyle Brecht, Board Member Joe Tatusko, Board Member Jerry Rolwing, General Manager
Agriculture	Dennis Jensen, Oasis Ranch Jim Seley, Seley Ranch Mike Seley, Seley Ranch (alternate) Duane Young, Cocopah Nurseries Ryan Hall, Borrego Farms
Recreation	Bill Berkley, Rams Hill Golf Course Jim Moxham, Borrego Springs Resort (alternate) Dan Wright, The Springs at Borrego and Road Runner Club
Watershed & Desert Ecosystem	Kathy Dice, Anza-Borrego State Park Ralph Singer, Anza Borrego Foundation
Community & Tourism	Martha Deichler, Borrego Springs Unified School District
University of California, Irvine	Emily Brooks, Doctoral Student