



IMPERIAL IRWMP

Integrated Regional Water Management Plan

Water Forum Meeting Notes

November 18, 2010, 9:00 –11:30 AM

Participants: See the attached sign in sheet.

Summary of Action Items

Summary of Decisions

Meeting Notes

Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review

Dale Schafer welcomed everyone, and then proceeded to introductions and agenda review.

Current Events- Stakeholder News

Anna Aljabiry from DWR reported that out of 43 applications for Regions of planning, IRWMP is being reviewed. The process is very detailed and results or recommendations will be heard before December 24, 2010. Implementation applications are due January 7, 2010 and 1/9th of each regions funding will be allocated in round one. Colorado basin 36million allocated but 4million for this region has been allocated due to Governor signing SB55 which gives the department to give an additional 1hundred million dollars to the region. This region will be 8 million and the projects submitted should address, reduce dependants on Sacramento San Joachim Delta. If your projects do not involve this you will be using your own monies, 4million and the 36million will still be intact. Workshops for implementation where held in Ventura, Sacramento, and Irvine. Second cycle will begin the end of June and figures have not been set but will notify when they come out.

Luis Olmedo from Comite Civico Del Valle Inc. in Brawley, informed the Water Forum of the US EPA. 300 million Federal Funding available from US EPA and 147 million already awarded to the California County Public Health for projects for improvements. Those interested can find the websites and information in the handout.

No questions on the TM 2.1 document had been sent to Tina Shields.

Tina Shield briefly updates on the Brock reservoir system. Mr. Andy Horn had questioned at the previous Water Forum meeting, if this is an example of a conservation method which can be implemented as a creative private project partnership.

The Brock Reservoir system is an 8 thousand acre ft off stream reservoir constructed in 2, 4 thousand cells located east of the Imperial Valley. Construction is almost complete and the first fill has been done.

There is a 6 ½ mile long in lit structure due to a natural habitat of flat tail lizards. The water gets parked into the cells and rereleased down Drop 2. This project is funded by MWD, Southern Nevada Water Authority, and Central Arizona Project through the Central Arizona Water Conservation District. IID is not a partner in the funding but will be responsible for the coordinated operation of the facility. The off-stream storage reservoir provides operational flexibility to capture water when there is a disparity between water that is ordered and what is delivered to users in the Lower Colorado River Region, in particular during storm events. Water conserved at Brock Reservoir will consist mainly of unused or rejected agriculture water orders that would otherwise flow to Mexico as excess flows (meaning this water is not considered a part of Mexico's 1.5 million acre-foot annual Colorado River water entitlement). The conserved water in Brock Reservoir will be used by IID to supplement Reclamation's releases from Hoover Dam intended to satisfy IID's daily water order.

Edith Harmon questioned how much acreage is used and the depth of the water in the reservoir will be?

Action: Provide design on the Brock Reservoir at the next Forum Meeting.

John Pierre Menvielle inputs that hydro power loses about 70 thousand dollar per year due to the Brock Reservoir.

Tina Shields explains that Imperial Irrigation District will be working with the BLM and power plants to offset the loss. One being a solar panel project placed near the hydro power plant and reservoir. Imperial Irrigation District is also working closely with the Bureau due to transportation losses on the water and in hopes costs are not inquired for the goal to be no net loss in the end.

Edith Harmon questioned if there will be assistance to the evaporation cost losses?

Tina Shields responds that there is no cover and that the reservoir is lined at the bottom to prevent seepage losses. At times the reservoir will be emptied but the in lit canal will be filled or partially for maintenance issues.

Alex Jack inquires if trees will be placed near the reservoir to offset any sand being blown into the reservoir. Mr. Jack farms on the west side next to the desert and has salt cedars growing to offset sand but when sandstorms arise, the cement ditches are completely filled with sand. Definitely feels this is an issue and should be looked into.

Tina Shields will present this issue to the Bureau in hopes of preventing any heavy maintenance.

Action: To inquire if trees will be placed at the Brock Reservoir and present at the next Forum Meeting.

Tina presented the information Mark McBroom had requested on the Overrun/Underrun with a longer history. Intent to show the flexibility of the dynamics of the Ag and the rainfalls plays on the Overrun/Underrun. Estimate of 1inch of rain reduces 40 to 60 thousand acre feet of demand. Prior to the QSA being implemented there was a high demand.

Anisa Divine explains that the 2010 is the estimate, yellow line is rainfall, next is acreage, and the red lines are the usage at the river. Boxes above the graph reflect the percentage of conservation being transferred.

Action: To present information on Lake Meade at the next Water Forum meeting.

Matt Zidar presents the terms of consisting conditions of the baseline on the TM. There will not be a huge difference on the baseline and this is why we are looking into other options such as desal or recycled water. Cities are doing urban water management plans and are relying on this raw water to be delivered to them. There need supply will change as there demand increases. The use of the Colorado River information should be reflected so it stays consistent. The four major cities, El Centro, Calexico, Brawley, and Imperial must update their urban water management plans in 2010 so this information is available for your reference.

Demand Management Work Group – Matt Zidar / Ron Hull

Matt explains 20% conservation by 2020 applies to the residential, commercial, and industrial. You may elect to implement individually to seek the 20% conservation or as a region.

Ron Hull presents the finding of the Demand Management Work Group in which baselines are correct to represent the future forecasts.

- Data needed to be defined
- Urban Cities not included into the report
- To have County participate for representing those Urban Cities

Matt explains consistencies of methods are being updated and a standard method should be implemented so everyone is on the same level.

George Galvan at the Demand Management Work Group presented the idea of having DWR hold a workshop on Urban Water Management.

Equity was discussed and taking out industrial leaving residential and commercial to look into the methods of their conservation.

Alex Jack questions if numbers can be scued throughout California, is evaporation taken into account?

This is true and you must look into the indoor/outside use. Areas will differ on their usage and should be looked into in the Demand.

Anisa Divine comments that the City of Calexico and City of El Centro where not present at the Work Shops.

Edith Harmon presents her findings on the ground water, Ocotillo area. Projection of the existing zoning and water allowable will be overused if major changes do not take place. This information was given to Anisa Divine and Matt Zidar.

Ron Hull informs that Geothermal was represented by Charlene Wardlow at the Demand Management Work Shop.

- A gap showing in the unincorporated areas based on population and land use, neither where taken into account
- Baseline starting at 2005, 2010 and beyond the water use by then the segment of water in the imperial valley will be a lot higher

Matt explains when you do a forecast on just a population growth for just the urban areas you must look at the land use.

Next steps:

- Using the DWR
- Engaging Ag
- Receive presentations from IID
- To have IID Energy due the same
- Engage the Cities as well

Next Demand Management Work Group meeting will be held December 8, 2010 at 10am to 12noon, SDG & E Renewable Center.

Resources Management Strategies – Tom Sephton

Capital projects are being looked at due to the water in the Valley being capped. Outcome from the work group meeting follows:

- Timeline of Prop 84 versus IRWMP progress can hit 2nd round in July 2011. Prop 84 is short term and can be effected due to the limited time frame
- Definition of Near Term 1 – 3 yrs, Mid Term 3 – 10 yrs, long term 10+yrs
- Prioritizing Strategies, Resource management Strategy Review Criteria
 - Top priority to capture maximum underrun
- Future water supply needed, estimates range 75 KAF/yr to 150 KAF/yr
- Groundwater Resources, estimated capacity 50KAF/yr with recharge
 - Groundwater opportunities
 - West mesa, opposition to River water
 - East Mesa , need recharge, BLM owns land
 - CVWD, has capacity in existing storage
 - Arizona and Lower Colorado, not available
- Municipal Wastewater recycling, Current 16 KAF/yr, Future 36 KAF/yr
 - Farmers resistant to using treated wastewater
 - Designate non food crop areas for use

- Conveyance, off the table, Sea to Sea concept suggested as long term option
- Surface storage, off the table due to evaporation
 - New River channel? No excess IID capacity

Ruben Mireles questions if the underrun can be used in the next years?

Tom explains no, you must actually capture the water in order to receive credit.

Alex Jack presents his own conservation methods and Imperial Irrigation District not receiving the credit and should. Examples given of conservation methods used by farmers are pump backs or drip systems.

Tom explains that this plan is for credits given to those conserving.

Tina explains that there is a program called the intentionally created surplus program in which you can implement capital improvement projects and receive credits in the reservoir system, Lake Mead. The only eligible programs for Imperial Irrigation District to participate in are storage credits related to seepage recovery pumps and tailwater recovery from Metropolitan. Discussions on farm components are still being worked and resistance from other states have arised but are willing to be receptive in the future. Under these policies and rules the Bureau has adopted, Imperial Irrigation District can store up to 50 thousand acre ft of water, accumulative total and there being an annual limitation. 25 thousand acre feet of water is the limitation for Lake Mead and the other half is for Metropolitan Water, which will be stored in their systems for accessing in the future by IID. Projects that qualify are very limited at this point for IID. IID must collaborate with the Lower and Upper basin in order to maintain the elevation of Lake Mead to not trigger any excess from Lake Powel. Losses are associated of 5% deposit fee and annual evaporation charges of 3% as well for storage use.

Charlene Wardlow questions if there are any other projects beyond the QSA? How can we receive credit for projects now and not have to wait till 2017?

Tina explains the opportunities are not feasible at this time. Any conserved water for the year by farmers are basically freeing water for other users. The abilities are not implemented to store conserved water at this time such as a service reservoir or ground water storage. Water is being created but for accounting basis, yearly, cannot be carried over for future use. That is why storage opportunities are important and the federal programs are limited. In order to maximize the use you must divert the water and store in order to receive a carryover on an annual basis.

Tom explains funding is a challenge but possible for the region and IID as the primary driver to create some system in crediting Ag, Industrial, and Geothermal participating in aggressive conservation methods over and above the QSA, along with a baseline, would be beneficial. Those new businesses can pay into the system and the farmers can receive a financial benefit down the road for their conservation methods.

Rodney Williams request clarification on two big issues mentioned. One being Alex Jack's comment on his conservation method in which he implemented is this a direct credit to the QSA, on farm conservation or whether a new program wanting to surface for the IID to look into?

Tina clarifies that the schedules for on farm component does not kick off until 2013.

Rodney Williams states to implement what the farmers have accomplished, the on farm conservation stating what it said, and the monies paid to the Valley or iid in the next 75yrs, should initially be given to the farmers. IID has now stated 85% will be going to system conservation and 45 million, approximately, will be going to on farm conservation. So a small amount will be returned to the farmers of the initial 332 million. Farmers such as Alex Jack have invested thousands of dollars to conserve water that they will not receive credit unless the policies are retroactive and encompass the people who have already spent the money to develop the conservation to save the water to help the system. These are some of the implemented conservation methods discussed such as center pivots, hand line solid set system, and drip system in which farmers are using. To have all farmers implement these on farm conservation methods within one or two years which should have been over a ten yr period to compensate and cut back on the fallowing program for the opportunity to install this program does not sound feasible. Policies and documents should be made public due to federal policies being implemented on conservation loans which would take a huge burden off the IID. For every farmer in this Valley, which are all eligible, to receive a minimum of 300,000.00 today and some can received up to 100,270,000.00 to implement on farm conservation as of September 20th. This would alleviate some of the QSA issues and set aside an additional program that would take care of other problems in order to create another water bank.

Tina explains that the focus is to build upon the baseline and work as though the QSA is being implemented in order to build projects on top of the QSA.

Rodney explains he has invested 500 thousand of his own monies to bring in a center pivot conservation implementation. Rodney did not see any support.

Tina conveys that we are restricted by the parameters of the QSA which include schedules and in large part the fallowing was an environmental constraint. We must adhere to those and move forward. The goal for operational improvements is to allow the system to have the flexibility to accommodate the on farm projects. If implementation of projects occurs without changing a 100 year old system, the water that farmers conserve will go back into the system and spill out into a drain.

Rodney states that Tom Sephton presented the number one goal, is for three things to occur:

- ground water development
- ground water banking
- saving water

Alex Jack explains his conservation methods on trial and error which has lead him to his recent project. In purchasing a 70 acre field in Westmorland to place a reservoir will help to offset the drip irrigations on his ranch. When water is needed at that moment the reservoir will alleviate the ordering process with the IID. At this time Alex wants to work with the IID if the system is carrying to much water, storage can be made available or how to spread the water to other ranches to irrigate. In the future we will need these small reservoirs throughout the Valley to gear up to the conservation. In looking at other systems in Coachella Valley already has implemented these small reservoirs and is modeling the process.

John Pier Menvielle states IID is under court order from the State Water Resources Board back in the early 80's with decision 16 hundred that we had to conserve 367 thousand acre ft of water. This is how MWD came about, 105 thousand, San Diego in 1998, and the QSA. Till the QSA is totally invalidated or thrown out we must comply and work along with the other water districts. People wanting Colorado River are how system improvement came about, first of 103 thousand acre ft and on farm of 2 hundred.

Rodney Williams shares that in August of this year he made a proposal to the IID to lease 18 hundred and 88 acres that has been out of productions for the last 10 or 9 years in order to place a center pivot system. IID would have the ability to go in and do monitoring at our expense to do a total test system for a 7 year lease. At this time discussions have occurred but nothing has been drafted.

Rodney feels if farmers where allowed to conserve the water without IID, this can be accomplished due to different methods out there and monies available right now but maybe not in two years.

Anisa Divine inquired where the monies are available right now.

Rodney explains current funding is available through NRCS.

Tom Sephton points out two issues. One, the mandated QSA conservation that has to happened, second, the conservation method of over and above the QSA mandates which we must follow. Past the parameters of the QSA which can be done, is a benefit to the Imperial Valley which in turn can credit those methods of conservation and making those water resources available.

Tom reports from the Projects Work Group in which what water supply would be needed there is a range of estimates that go from 75 thousand acre ft per yr up to a 100 thousand acre ft per yr of demand over and above what the allotments will be. Once the water transfers are in full effect, the amount of water available will be 2.7 million acre ft per year locally available water in which there is a deficit projected somewhere between 75 thousand and 150 thousand acre ft per yr. An estimate which Matt Zidar presented to the group that there would be a capacity of ground water storage in this Valley on the order of 50 thousand acre ft per yr so conserved water may be taken over and above the QSA which will be transferred. Underruns will be able to be captured, when there are underruns those years and recharge the local aquifers up to 50 thousand acre ft per year. Specific ground water storage areas where discussed one being the West Mesa. However, there is opposition of placing Colorado River in the water table due to the quality from rainfall and snow from the mountains is substantially better.

- East Mesa , need recharge, BLM owns land

East Mesa has the capacity but most of the land is owned by BLM and there are restrictions. The longer term of the East Mesa would have to be recharged. Recharge can be accomplished by underruns. To physically accomplish this agreements would have to be drawn between BLM and Reclamation to divert waters that are underruns and use some of the existing canals to place water in the East Mesa. Infrastructures will have to be build in order to extract the water.

The concept of mixing ground water with canal water was discussed and placing into the canals which has been met with some resistance due to increasing the salinity of the water being delivered.

- CVWD, has capacity in existing storage

CVWD has percolation basins built that are not in full capacity and conceivably IID may be able to purchase some capacity. The water would be delivered up the Coachella canal, used in Coachella, but provide a credit to IID against the water that is already being transferred.

- Arizona and Lower Colorado, not available

The perspective of those buying into those would not be possible due to a variety of regulations and restrictions.

- Ground water in Central Imperial Valley

Key issue to consider are soil permeability is low in the Central Imperial Valley. A recharge pond may be designed in the upper Central area but at the rate the water percolates to the lower aquifers is quite slow.

Edith Harmon requests to do away with the idea of recharge on the West Mesa due to needing an act of Congress to extend the boundaries of IID and USGS/EPA. Both agreed that it would not be a beneficial use of Colorado River to recharge the Ocotillo, Coyote Wells Basin due to the quality of water in the basin is much better. At this time no one treats the water at the basin and everyone is on individual wells. If recharge with poor quality water that had chemicals or biological contamination would mean people would have to give up using their domestic wells.

Tom responds that the discussion with in the group, there is a possibility of eliminating West Mesa for a recharge area. The best available opportunity for recharge is East Mesa and some limited in the Central Imperial Valley.

Anisa clarifies on the water in the Central Imperial Valley, 1 million acre ft, is saline and the estimated cost for desalting and delivering is around 5 hundred dollars an acre ft.

Tom informs that the next order of discussion from the Projects Work Group is all ground water resources are saline for the exceptions of West Mesa which has been eliminated. Any ground water development that is done on a large scale will have to incorporate desalination which can be fairly

efficiently done by RO process on the brackish water or the combination of a thermal RO process. Much of this water will come up hot in the range of 170 degrees. The possibility of capturing heat of the water is there and you cannot place 170 degree water into an RO system which will destroy the membranes and you must take the temperature down to about 100 for optimal operation conditions for RO which are in the range of 80 to 90 degrees. If the difference is captured, you may do thermal heat process and RO for desalination of that ground water. The evaluations that have been done by GEI for IID are extensively reported in the IID 2009 Planning document range from 4 to 6 hundred dollars per acre ft which comes out to about 500 per acre ft for building well fields, with drawing the water and placing through an RO process. In most cases discussions have occurred to dispose the brine by deep welling injections.

Alex Jack mentions that Tom touched on the subject of the salt in the Imperial Valley being substantial which would be accumulated with an RO process.

Tom explains that is why deep well injection had been discussed and for the opportunities for the salt to be used within the Imperial Valley. Concentrated brine is useful for thermal energy for solar thermal plant. Also, concentrated brine can be used directly for capturing solar energy and the Salton Sea KGRA (known geothermal resource area) deep aquifer is about 30% salt. The amount of development is modest and natural pecculation recharge fully preserves that aquifer. However if you brought that aquifer up to its full commercial potential, there might be a benefit to doing recharge and placing salt water down hole which would replace about 15 to 20% deficit.

Edith Harmon questions on deep well and highly injection saline water where it is 30% salt which you will run into problems with corrosion and equipment.

Tom explains that some studies have been done and the concerns are having constituents in the water that are incompatible with the aquifer. You do have to do a water treatment process that will allow compatibility with salt solution. Corrosion due to the brine is high and you would have to maintain with the use of allow materials if hot and plastic if not. The salinity going down hole would be less than what is being dealt with if correct materials and maintenance is in use.

- Municipal Wastewater recycling, Current 16 KAF/yr, Future 36 KAF/yr

Currently 16 KAF per year of water is going down and out to the Salton Sea. As development occurs in the future an increase of 36 KAF per year would be seen. Conceivably if some of that could be captured, treated and used.

- Farmers resistant to using treated wastewater

It is approved to use tertiary treated water and there is a marketing issue. Other options would be to

- Designate non food crop areas for use
- Improve the treatment and flow down the river to mix with agricultural drain flows and capture that water in a desal process to make available.

Charlene Wardlow comments on January 1 the draft EIR for East geothermal plant and its analyzes the city of Brawley waste water treatment plant for the water supply, would there not be water right issues if water is being taken out of the New River with the information just presented by Tom Sephton?

Tom responds that yes, if usage is impacting the Salton Sea. Example given such as Ormat, using water directly is a good utilization. Difficulties with some municipalities in which geothermal are not close, you must utilize pipes.

Linsey Dale requested clarification of designation of non food crop areas for use.

Tom reports that this was proposed by Matt Zidar at the Projects Work Group as a discussion. This would avoid a marketing problem and not using raw sewage but tertiary.

Matt clarifies that the ideas of matching quality to a use, not all beneficial users require the same level of quality which is an important point. The use of waste water and the level of treatment are mandated by state law by the department of health services and the regional water control board can be found in a table. Secondary use of water can be used on fiber crops, and if full tertiary treated titled 22 you may use that water, for example in the Salinas Valley. Then issues such as viability locally, politically acceptable, and if growers are concerned of tertiary waste water being delivered into the canals, blended or mixed, for resources again. These worries of being marketability and pipe connections taking water out of the canals, makes the water "fungible". Concept is for someone in a section of the Valley to contribute money to a fund to build the waste water treatment plant so you would not have to collocate your geothermal facilities to use the water and you would overcome that restriction. As long as the recovery is being paid that water would go into the system and use that water in lieu of Colorado River supplies. This is a new use and is going into the system which goes back to accounting where you are crediting for the investment and creation of new water. Now referring back to the land use issue, trying to find use for this waste water in lieu of taking Colorado River supplies(CRS), if there was a piece of property that could be contracted to take the water in lieu of the CRS and use it for what is legally appropriately used through the purple pipes. Any system that delivers highly treated waste water is delivered in a purple pipe that is State law. This is where you are integrating the concepts of matching water quality to water use, recycling waste water, conveyance, transfers (within the Imperial Valley) and/or exchange are idea's or concepts brought about at the Projects Work Group.

Matt explains that discussion of using the water on the property, if you created the mitigation bank that people need to buy into. One of the constraints of recycled water use, you take current water being spilled which end up into the Alamo or New River, removing that water has an effect on the habitat, which we know IID has had to mitigate. Example of this is the 1 thousand acre Wetlands Project. On the blending of water, which the Board requested, what would happen if taking the brackish black water and mixing it to set some goals to not increase it by 20 parts TDS, could water be made available? Knowing the increase in salt, you would have to over apply to leach the salts out of the soil. You would not receive a 1 to 1 credit if you do a blending, but taking 100 unites and mixing with 1 thousand units and only increase the salt by 20% there are already enough salt management issues on on farm so this

limits you to do. It does not limit you in doing to take water of that quality and use it for shrimp farms, algae productions, or other projects of this nature.

Linsey Dale understands the finding of no threat but growers are gaining restrictions every year. Examples of E coli from bird droppings into the crops or water have been studied.

Mark Gran would like to make sure the Water Forum and everyone is aware of what other government agencies on the flows into the Salton Sea are doing. Department of Water Resources and Fish and Game are setting up species habitats around the New and Alamo River. 24 hundred acres, which one of those two areas are being set up fairly quickly. The flow of the deltas will be needed to provide water for these species habitats. We must be aware of this when speaking of blending or flows into the sea, that there was a discussion from last time of mitigation of flows going from the drains into the Salton Sea. If you are going to place a development up you need to mitigate that lack of flow going into the sea. Taking out of the sea, mitigation also must be taken into consideration. This would be an accumulative effect rather than each individual project.

Matt incurs that this is a valid point. There was discussion of Mexicali, 150 thousand acre ft coming across from Mexico which are working to reclaim and is now at 75 thousand acre ft which there has been no mitigation for that loss. Also important to note that cities treat the waste water, they own that water. As of now it is being dumped into the river and being lost. Under State law the persons whom bear the costs of treatment take the title for the water. If water cannot be beneficially reused, then the need of taking the perspective of the loss should be compensated the other way around. It does not say that going to reuse you don't have to mitigate for the impacts to the drain habitats but a critical issue is the Salton Sea. Do you have the responsibility to do this? Technically no under the historical use you could have taken that water under your permit and a lot of cases land applications of waste water is the way you disposed of for the past 100 years, growing alfalfa in areas you had no way of discharging which is easier doing under a waste discharge permit rather than what is called an MPDS permit.

Edith Harmon understands the concerns of the Farm Bureau and the Agriculture community due to working closely with questions on sewage applications back in late 1990's. Japan denied any agriculture imports at this time if crops had been used which can lead to powerful economic impacts.

Tom Sephton continued to report from the Projects Work Group.

- Conveyance, off the table, Sea to Sea concept suggested as long term option

There are no other opportunities of bringing in other water supply resources than the Colorado River. In short term this is true. The concept of bring in water from the Sea of Cortez by an international agreement with Mexico. Desal in the Imperial Valley, and use the salt in renewable energy development. Use the water locally to reduce the water needed from the Colorado River would be a long term option.

- Surface storage, off the table due to evaporation being high at 5 to 6 acre ft per year of the Salton Sea and 9 acre ft off of fresh water.
 - New River channel? No excess IID capacity

Dale Schaffer announces that March meeting must be rescheduled and suggested March 24, 2010. No opposition at this time.

John Pierre Menvielle announces that December 9, 2010 San Diego Gas and Electric will be having a ground breaking ceremony up in Boulevard from 10:30am to 12 noon.

Barbara from SDG & E states the facility will be closed for this ceremony.

Location will be emailed for the December 9, 2010 Water Forum meeting.

Matt Zidar opens up the attendance to the Water Forum on the Demand Management or Projects Work Group to those interested. Edith Harmon and Luis Olmedo wish to join the Demand Management Work Group.

Matt Zidar states that the Work Groups will be bringing back the recommendations of to interpret using DWR management strategies for using in the IRWMP. Next, what is the process to be in making a call for preliminary projects to bring together and looking at which ones will really do fit a regional criteria or how they could be repackaged and brought together in context to the IRWMP. To meet the goal of just not the IRWMP but the funding criteria with DWR. Anticipation of a call on projects to get a preliminary list of what is out there; which could go on at DHS, State revolving loan fund, the regional board for water treatment, or federal funding. Some might still be silo projects that do not meet the regional goal but need to be identified. This can also be included in other funding that might exist.

Anisa Divine comments that Environmental should be added to the Demand list.

Matt states yes, and this is in the BMP (Best Management Practices). Note that the supply group was not discussed but next steps for this group are to discuss the types of water quality. To initiate the talks on flood control and flood water at that conceptual level.

Luis Olmedo announces there is strategic planning occurring with AB1079, the New River Improvement Project. Next Water Forum meeting Luis Olmedo will present an update.

Andy Horne states on December 9, 2010 there will be public workshops scheduled for the New river Improvement Project held at SDG&E Renewable Center and in Brawley.

Meeting Adjourned – Dale Schafer

Next Meeting - Thursday, December 9, 2010; 9:30-11:30 AM , Imperial Irrigation District, Water Control Conference Room, 333 E. Barioni Blvd, Imperial, Ca.

Imperial IRWMP Website - <http://imperialirwmp.org/>