

## BWC Meeting Notes

### Agenda and Goals

- The acting facilitator opened the meeting, and reviewed agenda items:
  - Knowledge Sharing; update all members on their understanding of recent activities/ events and external information; including Wilhelmina Sumer's report.
  - Develop an approach to position the Representative Committee to best serve the needs of the BWC and its stakeholders. How best to position the group to serve the community.
  - Continue development of GSP; including improving upon baseline and capturing savings to date.
  - Define approach and ownership for next steps.
- Prior to the meeting, items related to Sumer's report, drought conservation measures, and a meeting with County representatives were distributed to members via email, and made available on the BWC dropbox. One additional financial document was distributed via email during the meeting.
- Members welcomed a new representative from the Borrego Air Ranch, and reviewed the Mission and goals of the BWC.

### General Updates

- Action Items from previous meetings were reviewed.
- A member updated the group on expected scientific reports and studies related to the BVGB. The USGS report has been sent to print, and should be available shortly. A report from the Bureau of Reclamation is also expected to be received soon.
- A member shared an outstanding invoice received from BWC counsel. Members discussed how to resolve the invoice.
  - **ACTION ITEM - Members** to review Rutan invoices and records of who has paid what, review payments already made, and assess next steps for how to invoice and pay.

### Discussion Re: Role of BWC with GSAs (San Diego County and BWD)

- The Representative Committee summarized a meeting with County representatives, during which they advocated for the BWC's ability to represent stakeholders and act as a sounding board. Reference notes on meeting with County distributed before the meeting.
- Key points include:
  - The County and the BWD will act as GSAs. The County will oversee land use and the BWD will oversee water use, but the County is in charge.

- The BWC would be viewed as a stakeholder, but would not have an equal seat at the table with the other GSAs.
- The County reiterated that they require stakeholder involvement and transparency. They understand that the BWC represents the major stakeholders. They can't listen to the BWC to the exclusion of other voices, but they recognize there is value to be added from the BWC.
- General discussion on this update followed. Questions and issues raised include:
  - The Sponsor Group was mentioned as having a formal role engaging with the County on land use issues. It was asked whether the BWC could serve a parallel function on water use; County responded this is not an applicable comparison.
  - The County confirmed that it wouldn't help if the BWC was a 501c3 organization, and that it is not necessarily helpful to have an MOU, etc. The most important thing the BWC can do is have active participation in the process. We need to get involved and stay involved, and any formal role is secondary.
  - A Member asked how feedback for the County integrates in to BWD timeline/plans for GSA/GSP. There are continued opportunities for participation, given that all the processes must be public. The County will be careful about what they give to the BWD, given that they have 3 other, very complicated basins to deal with who will want the same thing.
  - A Member asked whether water credits had been discussed. This was not covered in detail during the meeting with the County, other than this issue could be worked on.
- Members discussed next steps:
  - It was recommended that the BWC connect with Supervisor Bill Horn's office and take meetings there. Being sponsored by DWR should also give leverage here.
  - **ACTION ITEM - Member** to draft letter to Bill Horn to follow up on Representative Committee meeting with County and BWD, and to begin developing relationship and role for GSP process going forward. Goal is to help keep BWC in the loop and giving input regarding components of GSP that BWC can/can't live with.
  - The Representative Committee should stay proactive and reach out to other agencies to build relationships with.

## **Next Steps for Outreach and Working w/ County**

- This agenda item continues a discussion from previous meetings regarding how to reach out to other stakeholder groups (like the Stewardship Council and Sponsor Group).

- Suggestions discussed include:
  - Monthly or other regular meetings with the County via Jim Bennett, with BWC members to send follow up letters recapping what they take from the meeting and what the BWC can do to add value to the County's process.
  - Develop a target list for outreach to other stakeholders, and strengthen the overall position of BWC within the GSP process. Other community members may prefer to work with the BWC versus the BWD or County. The BWC should make sure their goals don't conflict with the goals of other relevant groups, such as: Stewardship Council, Sponsor Group, Village Association. Once a stakeholder list has been created, BWC members could set meetings to share information about legislation and process, and to keep in touch regularly.
- A Member suggested that the BWC lay out an agenda and list of information to share prior to conducting outreach to other stakeholders. Members could then meet informally and in small groups with members of other stakeholder groups to share what's happening, and find out what they would like to be kept informed on. Engaging in this process between stakeholders would also add value for the County.

### Next Steps for GSP Development

- Due to time constraints, Members agreed that the Baseline Working Group would hold their working session "offline".
- The Baseline Working Group reviewed their goals, and Members discussed general concerns related to the collection of baseline data. Key points include:
  - It is important to keep collecting baseline data, so that the BVGB can potentially hit conservation and reduction thresholds that are 15-20 years out today. It would send a very positive message if the BWC could consolidate different industries (agriculture, golf, etc.) and what they've done to date to conserve, even if those industries are not subject to drought reduction measures.
  - Members discussed the need to do public outreach about conservation measures. For example, the public needs to hear what farmers are doing to conserve water; currently, they're only hearing that farmers are abusing the water.
  - A Member noted that baseline data could allow the industries represented by Members to get credit for what they've already done, and to shift the amount left to conserve. The 70% reduction number used by the BWC may no longer be accurate.
  - Consolidating baseline data would also demonstrate the value of the BWC as a stakeholder group because the BWC has access to historical data and can run trials.
  - **ACTION ITEM (ADDED TO #4):** Members will be emailed to collect conservation measures to date; Member will contact AAWARE members for same. **Baseline Group** will compile, and distribute results to group.
- Members of the Baseline Working Group presented and discussed their current working model.

Thursday, July 9, 2015

- A Member noted that the Working Group will have to reconcile with the USGS report says with what Members think their actual usage is, and will have to figure out what assumptions are built in to the model and how strong they are. The USGS model focuses on what's going on under the ground, while the Working Group's model can add what's going on above the aquifer, such as return rates.
- A Member asked whether there is a need to reach out to agriculture more broadly, beyond the BWC Members in the room. A Member responded that AAWARE is familiar with the issues discussed by the BWC, but agreed that outreach could be done to shore up baseline data collection.

## **Presentation and Discussion of Sumer's Report**

- Wilhelmina Sumer (UCI Graduate Student) presented her report on surveys of planning interventions for groundwater management in Southern California as they pertain to the Borrego Valley. This report was produced in fulfillment of Sumer's M.A. degree, and is written as an internal document provided to the BWC to use at their discretion. Members asked questions regarding data sources, conclusions, and plans for distribution.
- Members discussed whether to issue an official disclaimer that the BWC served as an input for information, but not as a formal "client". Members determined that a formal disclaimer was not required at this time, but that meeting notes should document that the report does not officially reflect the opinions and concerns of the BWC as a group.
- Members determined that meeting notes should include the following disclaimer appended to Ms. Sumner's report. This disclaimer has been verified by BWC members:
  - *\*Disclaimer: The views and opinions expressed in this report are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the University of California or the Borrego Water Coalition. Assumptions made within the analysis are not reflective of the position the Borrego Water Coalition.*

## **Action Items Recap and Next Steps**

- The list of action items was reviewed and updated.
- The next meeting dates are: October TBA, November TBA, December TBA.

Thursday, July 9, 2015

## Attendance

Borrego Water District

Jerry Rolwing, General Manager  
Joe Tatusko, Board Member (alternate)

Agriculture

Ryan Hall, Borrego Farms (alternate)  
Dennis Jensen, Oasis Ranch  
Jim Seley, Seley Ranch  
Mike Seley, Seley Ranch

Recreation

Bill Berkley, Rams Hill Golf Course  
Mike Hickok, De Anza Country Club  
Jim Moxham, Borrego Springs Resort (alternate)  
Dan Wright, Roadrunner Club

Community & Tourism

Martha Deichler, Borrego Springs School District  
Linda Haddock, Chamber of Commerce  
Mike Himmerich, Borrego Air Ranch  
Jim Wilson, Christmas Circle Park Foundation

Ecosystems

Ralph Singer, Anza-Borrego Foundation

University of California, Irvine

Emily Brooks, Doctoral Student