

MEETING SUMMARY – SEPTEMBER 17, 2013

BORREGO WATER COALITION

1. Status of Action Items from July, Adoption of July 11 Meeting Summary, and Other General Business

- All items were complete with the exception of #4 and #6.
- Regarding #4, the Borrego Water District Board (BWD) noticed their intention to update the Groundwater Management Plan (GWMP). A corresponding public meeting is tentatively scheduled for October 23, at 9 am.
- Regarding #6, Supervisor Horn's office is planning a public workshop in Borrego Valley for October or November to discuss flood issues. Residential flood protection requirements are likely to remain the same.
- **AGREEMENT:** The group adopted the July 11 meeting summary with the tracked changes.

2. November 12 Public Meeting

- The group should begin planning its November public meeting as soon as possible.
- A work group will prepare draft needed materials.

3. Discussion of GWMP Requirements

- Mr. Tim Ross, DWR, reviewed the handout. There is no difference in requirements for updating a plan as compared with developing a new plan.
- Many aspects of the existing plan are out of date.
- The group should focus on objectives and implementation, including funding, accountability, and roles and responsibilities.
- Some helpful examples exist.
 - **ACTION ITEM:** BWD to send list of good groundwater management plan examples to DWR for additions, and to post the plans to Dropbox under new folder "Example Plans"
- BWD has the authority to update the plan and requirements for public noticing and participation. It will be important to clarify the relationship between the BWD's mandated process and the Borrego Water Coalition.

4. Discussion of Potential Consultant Support and Associated Funding

- The group identified potential criteria for selecting a consultant which included:
 - Affordability: they provide the deliverable at a fixed price not-to-exceed a given amount, rather than charging for each bit of time and materials

- Production of a defensible product: they have the needed breadth and depth of technical capacity, and high quality reputation
- Compatibility with the community: they are inclusive of the various concerns and interests, and interact well with diverse community members
- Expertise: they have expertise in economic forecasting and economics more generally (e.g., impacts to the community of increased water costs)
- Impartiality: they provide a neutral assessment of the options available to the BWC
- Possible information that would aid in evaluating consultants could include reviewing a list of their historical clients, calling their professional references, and reviewing their historical plans and products.
- The USGS now anticipates having its report available in October.
 - The facilitator suggested that the group needs to have a process that allows layperson members to ask questions and verify how findings were derived, at the same time as the group needs to have a shared commitment to working with the technical results provided by the consultant or agency. Having clear criteria for selecting a consultant, ensuring all members are comfortable with the selected consultant, having a clear scope of work and deliverables for the consultant, and opportunities to ask the consultant about their approach and methods were the first steps in this process.
- The group agreed that it was premature to select a consultant.
- **ACTION ITEM:** All members to send in their initial ideas about the practical approaches to managing groundwater to the facilitator by close of business on Friday, September 27
- **ACTION ITEM:** All members to review the existing GWMP and identify the major policy areas that a revised plan should cover before October 3

5. Initial Sketch of a Vision

- Each member of the group responded to the question, Why are you here – what must the future include for this process to be considered successful?
- **AGREEMENT:** Members agreed to establish a Vision Work Group.
- **ACTION ITEM:** Facilitator to set up a Vision Work Group call and draft a vision based on 9/17 discussion for their review
- **ACTION ITEM:** Facilitator to speak with each of the Coalition members in the coming month

6. Status of UCI-NSF Proposal

- The final UCI proposal was now submitted to NSF.
- Concern was expressed that the researchers had not spoken to all constituencies in the region. It was noted in response that the proposal laid out what would be done if a grant were obtained, not what had been done.

- Concern was expressed that the research would remain conceptual and abstract, and not actually help the BWC or community. It was emphasized that, if the grant were obtained, the researchers should clearly explain their activities.
- It was noted that the UCI relationship extends beyond the NSF grant, and therefore suggested that a letter describing the overall partnership be developed. This would help clarify how the two groups interacted and whether additional structure was needed.
- **AGREEMENT:** Members agreed to work on draft partnership letter for review by the full group on October 3.
- **ACTION ITEM:** UCI Letter Drafting Team to draft partnership letter with UCI, for BWC review on October 3.

7. Introduction of Suggested Governance Clarifications

- Regarding Appendix B (Reaching Consensus for Recommendations), the group explained that it made all decisions by consensus. The decision-making language should revert to the existing language in the MOU.
 - **ACTION ITEM: Facilitator** to revise the MOU Recommended Clarification so that Appendix B: Consensus reverted to the existing MOU
- Regarding Observers (New Header #13), if UCI were to have a representative to the BWC, that person should also be bound by the MOU. Any change in the representative would have to be provided in writing to the BWC for its review. That person would need to be able to answer questions about related UCI projects.
 - It was suggested to verify the following: (1) Whether the dialogue between UCI and BWC would be two-way through the representative, allowing for sharing concerns and suggestions from both sides. (2) When the student anticipated publishing her dissertation results. (3) How the student is already bound to confidentiality and/or other standards by the University's human subjects/research review committee requirements.
- Regarding the Organizational Structure of the BWC (New Header #5), the group agreed that a Coordinating Committee and ability to create work groups would advance their efforts.
 - **AGREEMENT:** The BWC agreed to designate a Coordinating Committee and clarify its ability to create work groups.
 - **ACTION ITEM: Facilitator** to set up Coordinating Committee call to review draft 10/3 agenda
- The facilitator recommended that the group track this agreement, and when it had all clarifications to the MOU complete, adopt these clarifications as a single document. This document could then be appended to the existing MOU.

8. Logo Selection and Invoice Approval

- The group adopted a logo.

- **AGREEMENT:** The BWC will use the logo that includes an orange center, and a white line around the water droplet.

9. Formalization of Coalition

- It was noted that the group possesses various assets (e.g., logo). Non-profits were common and effective, and would also make the group eligible for certain funding.
 - The cost of forming a non-profit would range from approximately \$1,000 to \$3,000. The latter cost assumed that a lawyer would be hired to help ensure the board of directors and bylaws were sufficient to meet federal requirements.
- One option would be to partner with an existing non-profit. Other options include forming a limited liability corporation or an association of some sort.
- **ACTION ITEM:** All members with further ideas on how to formalize the coalition to send description of the option(s) to the facilitator by close of business on September 27
- **ACTION ITEM:** Facilitator to distribute Melissa Data links re: non-profits

10. Attendees

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Agriculture | Bill Bauer – Borrego Farms Dennis Jensen - Oasis Ranch Management Company Jim Seley – Seley Ranches Mike Seley – Seley Ranches Duane Young - Cocopah |
| Recreation | Bill Berkley - Rams Hill Golf Course Derek Downey – La Casa del Zorro Resort and Spa Jim Moxham – Borrego Springs Resort Jim Wermers – De Anza Country Club |
| Borrego Water District | Lyle Brecht – BWD Board Member Beth Hart – BWD Board Member Jerry Rolwing – BWD General Manager |
| Schools | Martha Deichler – Borrego Spring Unified School District |
| Commercial Business | Linda Haddock – Borrego Springs Chamber of Commerce |
| Public Space | Jim Wilson – Christmas Circle Park |
| Watershed and Desert Ecosystems | Kathy Dice – Anza Borrego State Park Ralph Singer – Anza Borrego Foundation |
| CA Dept of Water Resources | Laura Peters, Senior Engineer Tim Ross, Senior Engineer |
| Center for Collaborative Policy | Dorian Fougères, Senior Mediator |