



IMPERIAL IRWMP

Water Forum Meeting Notes

ImperialIRWMP.org

Date: Thursday, March 24, 2011

Time: 9:00–11:30 noon

Location: SDG&E

Participants: See the attached sign in sheet.

Upcoming Meetings

- April 20: Energy Workshop @ 10:00-12:00 am
- April 20: Projects WG @ 1:30-3:30 pm
- April 21: Water Forum Meeting
- May 19: Water Forum Meeting (tentative)
- June 16: Water Forum Meeting

Follow-up Actions

Topic	Action	Follow-up
Increase Water Supply - Groundwater Development RMS, Additional Specific Findings and Recommendations, Groundwater Development, West Mesa bullet, p 4	Edie and Armando to confer and agree on language, which will be brought back to WF for action; provide to Anisa Divine by 4/14, at ajdivine@IID.com	Edie Harmon Armando Villa
Increase Water Supply - Groundwater Development RMS, Additional Specific Findings and Recommendations, Groundwater Development, East Mesa bullet, p 4	Updated text will be up for adoption at next WF <i>Without additional groundwater studies, East Mesa groundwater development on a large scale may not be sustainable over the long-term since there is limited natural recharge or sustained yield, and water quality is variable and in most areas brackish. Large scale development may have to be coupled with desalination and a recharge program.</i>	Water Forum
Change Increase Water Supply, Recycled Municipal Water RMS, Additional Findings and Recommendations, bullet 3, p 7	Submit new language to Anisa by 4/14, ajdivine@iid.com	Water Forum
	Forward to WF	Anisa
	Update to read: <i>Require mitigation for state and federal requirements for loss of flows to IID drains and to the New and Alamo Rivers and other waterways through development of a regional mitigation bank...</i>	Matt
Increase Water Supply, Conveyance – Regional/local, CALFED, Large Interregional Conveyance, first open bullet, p 11	Updated text will be up for adoption at next WF: <i>IRWMP Objectives – Large interregional conveyance coupled with water quality treatment could meet IRWMP goals and objectives, but the current cost estimates are higher than any current users would be willing to pay in the near-term. A large interregional conveyance designed primarily for the restoration of the Salton Sea is beyond the scope of this IRWMP.</i>	Water Forum

Summary of Decisions

▪ RMS Comments on Findings

RMS Findings Reference	Change Language	WF Decision
Table 2 RMS, Improve Operational Efficiency and Transfers, Water Transfers – Out-of-Basin	<i>Out-of-basin transfers do not meet Imperial IRWMP Water Supply Goal (and objectives) to provide a firm, verifiable, and sustainable supply to meet current and future demands.</i>	Adopt
Increase Water Supply, Groundwater Development, Political Acceptability, Interregional, p 4 bullet	<i>Junior appropriators may be willing and able to subsidize groundwater banking and storage projects for a percentage of the yield; however any project that includes out-of-basin water transfers will not be part of this IRWMP.</i>	Remove Bullet
Increase Water Supply, Desalination, Political Acceptability, Interregional, p 9 bullet	<i>Interregional interests may be willing and able to subsidize groundwater banking and storage projects for a percentage of the yield. That would lessen interregional political opposition; however any project that includes out of basin water transfers will not be part of this IRWMP.</i>	Remove Bullet
Reduce Water Demand - Urban Water Efficiency Findings, Urban Demand Management Recommendations, UWC 2, p 3	<i>Water Forum and Cities should coordinate the 2010 UWMP updates.</i>	Adopt
Agricultural Water Use Efficiency RMS, Findings, Table 1	Change 9 th row to read: <i>temporary voluntary fallowing</i>	Adopt
	Add: <i>Mitigation requirements (community impacts, environmental impacts, etc) for these water sources are unknown to the Table Notes</i>	Adopt
Table 1 RMS Remaining for Dev/ Integration; Increase Water Supply Mgt Obj, Conjunctive Management & Groundwater Storage RMS	<i>Groundwater banking is the IRWMP number one priority to maximize IID's annual water supply entitlement and minimize under runs.</i>	Adopt

▪ RMS Findings

Management Objective	Resource Management Strategy Findings	Status
Increase Water Supply	Groundwater Development, Conjunctive Use, Storage and Banking	Pending
	Desalination	Adopted
	Recycle Municipal Water	Pending
	Conveyance (Regional/Local, CALFED)	Pending
	Storage (Regional/Local, CALFED)	Adopted
	Precipitation Enhancement	Adopted
Reduce Water Demand	Agricultural Water Use Efficiency	Adopted
	Urban Water Use Efficiency	Adopted

- Other

Topic	Title	Status
Prioritize IRWMP Plan Goals	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Water Supply 2. Water Quality 3. Environmental Protection and Enhancement 4. Flood Protection and Stormwater Management 	Adopted
Technical Memo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Disadvantaged Community Needs Assessment 	Adopted

Meeting Notes

Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review

Dale Schafer called the meeting to order at 9:16 am, and reviewed the agenda.

Current Events – Stakeholder News

- **On March 29th, IID is having a special board meeting.** The meeting will cover groundwater related topics, and will be held at IID’s board room in El Centro.
- **On May 24th-25th, CDWR is hosting a conference on the Integrated Regional Planning process.** Anna Aljabiry said CDWR has collected feedback to determine what the regions will need to complete their IRWMPs. CDWR has requested speakers from all interested regions statewide. The cost is \$195 to attend. <http://www.watereducation.org/doc.asp?id=1899&parentID=849>.
- **Intent of IRWMP.** Andy Horne, of the Imperial County, addressed Rodney Williams’ question from the February WF meeting referring to policy. The Program Management Team’s discussion revolved around whether or not the IRWM Plan is binding, creating policy, or advising to any of the agencies. Andy told the WF that the IRWM Plan will only set parameters of how the projects can be considered part of the Plan, and will identify potential sources of water within the region that can fit CDWR’s guidelines. Andy clarified that the WF is not creating policy that will be binding or advisory to any of the region’s agencies, which is stated formally in the WF Charter. The WF aims to create a plan that agencies can use as guidelines when creating their own policies, goals, and objectives.

Tina Shields reminded the WF that the development of the Imperial IRWM Plan is a regional planning process and is not intended to serve as a policy document or obligate participating agencies or participants to certain projects, goals, objectives or programs collectively identified or prioritized in this work effort. WF participants should be reminded that each agency retains its individual decision-making authority regardless of the recommendations or outcomes delineated in the IRWMP, however it should be the goal of all participants to consider the information, priorities, and perspectives obtained during this planning effort during each agency’s individual planning and decision-making process. The final IRWM Plan might not align with each agency’s current policies, and the plan should respect the goals and objectives defined by the WF stakeholders. Hopefully the WF can create an adoptable plan to help this region access state funding opportunities, implement projects that meet multiple agencies’ goals and contribute to a more regional way of thinking as it pertains to water issues. And at the

very least, if this plan helps the Imperial Region to have a common sense of direction, or at least a better understanding of conflicting interests, for projects with a water nexus, this will be a big planning step for the Imperial Region.

- **Forum Agenda.** Dale announced that the March meeting has an ambitious agenda, which will require focused discussions. If appropriate, the WF will vote on adopting RMS findings at this meeting. If the discussion dictates, the WF will vote on the RMS findings at the April meeting.
- **The Notice of Intent for the Imperial IRWMP** was placed in the Imperial Valley Press newspaper on March 20, 2011.

Exercise: Prioritize IRWMP Goals

The WF divided into groups to discuss prioritization of four adopted IRWM Plan goals. The fifth adopted goal, Regional Policy Goals, is considered as an overarching goal, therefore not necessary to prioritize. At the conclusion of the exercise, the group came to a consensus, prioritizing the goals as follows:

1. Water Supply
2. Water Quality
3. Environmental Enhancement and Protection
4. Flood Protection and Stormwater Management

RMS Scoping Findings & TM on DAC Needs

Tina explained that the WF had not yet formalized the process of out-of-region transfers. It is the Imperial IRWM Plan's number one goal to maximize water use within the region. The suggested language was written as follows:

Out-of-basin transfers do not meet Imperial Region IRWMP Water Supply Goal (and objectives) to provide a firm, verifiable, and sustainable supply to meet current and future demands.

Andy voiced his agreement, adding that out-of-region transfers do nothing to enhance our water use. Dale asked if any stakeholders could not live with the suggested language. It was decided by consensus that this wording should be adopted.

Decision: Adopt suggested language for Table 2 RMS, Improve Operational Efficiency and Transfers, Water Transfers – Out-of-Basin: *Out-of-basin transfers do not meet Imperial IRWMP Water Supply Goal (and objectives) to provide a firm, verifiable, and sustainable supply to meet current and future demands.*

Dale explained that action was not taken at the last meeting because there were several comments on each finding. Dale listed the new WF meeting method:

First Meeting: Introduce- Present draft findings (from the work group; or Draft IID Plan); Forum review and email written comments and requested changes to Anisa Divine, ajdivine@iid.com. PMT and/or staff and consulting team will review and advise.

Second Meeting: Discuss comments and recommended change(s); adopt the finding if possible.

Third Meeting: Adopt Findings.

Dale announced that the WF would review and discuss comments at this meeting, and accept them thereby adopting the findings, if possible.

First comment: Increase Water Supply, Groundwater Development, Political Acceptability, Interregional bullet, p 4. The text was rewritten to clarify that out-of-water basin projects will not be part of this IRWM Plan:

Junior appropriators may be willing and able to subsidize groundwater banking and storage projects for a percentage of the yield; however any project that includes out of basin water transfers will not be part of this IRWMP.

Tina proposed the reference be taken out of the text altogether. This reference is difficult to present to the authorities within our respected agencies and complicates the adoption of the Plan. Andy agreed the text should be removed, adding that the language is contradictory. Dale asked if any stakeholders could not live with the motion of removing this statement. It was decided by consensus that this wording would be removed from the text.

Decision: Remove entire Increase Water Supply, Groundwater Development, Political Acceptability, Interregional, p 4 bullet.

Second comment: Increase Water Supply, Groundwater Development, Additional Specific Findings and Recommendations, Groundwater Development, West Mesa bullet, p 4. The text was rewritten to say:

West Mesa is at or exceeding the sustainable yield and further development or use of these resources would have to be consistent with the Imperial County Groundwater Ordinance and existing policies to prevent further or additional local overdraft.

Dale asked if any stakeholders disagreed with the comment. Edith (Edie) Harmon mentioned that the local overdraft is an important topic and it should be included for discussion basin-wide. Edie explained that the Ocotillo aquifer is part of the West Mesa, which is basically fossil water from the ice age. Andy was concerned that titling the Mesa's "East" and "West" is confusing, because IID has a West Mesa unit that does not test the entire West Mesa. Andy asked if there are two distinct basins on the west side of Imperial County. Edie explained that there is not a real use of water east of Ocotillo/Coyote Wells because the water is very saline. She believes there to be water north of Allegretti Farms from Borrego Springs and mountain runoff recharge, although the water has a number of different water quality issues. Andy asked if this section is part of the West Mesa.

Edie said that the CDWR's basin definition is different than USGS's definition. Edie says the west side of the county uses several different names for these basins. Armando Villa suggested the West Mesa be addressed by its different basin names because each basin has different water characteristics. Edie suggested it be considered as three separate basins. Matt added that the condition of overdraft is a basin-wide condition. Dale announced that this topic will be addressed at a later meeting. Comments should be sent in writing to Anisa by April 14.

Action: Increase Water Supply, Groundwater Development, Additional Specific Findings and Recommendations, Groundwater Development, West Mesa bullet, p 4: Edie and Armando will confer and agree on language, which will be brought back to WF for action; provide to Anisa Divine by April 14, at ajdivine@IID.com (**Edie Harmon and Armando Villa**).

Third comment: Increase Water Supply, Groundwater Development, Additional Specific Findings and Recommendations, Groundwater Development bullet, East Mesa, p 4. The text was rewritten to say:

East Mesa groundwater development on a large scale would not be sustainable over the long term since there is limited natural recharge or sustained yield, and water quality is variable and in most areas brackish. Large scale development may have to be coupled with desalination and a recharge program.

Jim Brock asked what constitutes large, and how was it determined that most areas are brackish. Matt replied that large is defined as 75,000-100,000 AF per year per the *Draft IID Plan*. The water was determined brackish by a published report from the Lawrence Livermore lab. The water was defined as 500 ppm¹. Jim responded that under that condition, Colorado River water is considered brackish. Jim suggested that given the current level of data, it can't be determined that it is all brackish water. Matt said that long-term groundwater development without recharge will lead to many salt issues. Tom Topuzes requested a definition of "long-term". Tom also asked if the tests were performed in the middle or edge of the aquifers.

Anisa suggested the language be changed to say "said water quality is variable". Jim suggested "may not be sustainable" instead of "would not". Tina suggested a caveat in the groundwater section that states there may be additional studies, and present data might be obsolete. Anisa suggested "may not be sustainable over the long-term".

Matt said that in long-term use (50 years) the basin could not be used without recharge. There is not a lot of recharge available and very little natural sustainability. Realistically, over time there will be a lot of salt. There can be a caveat limiting the number of wells.

Andy suggested: *"Without additional groundwater studies, East Mesa groundwater development on a large scale may not be sustainable over the long-term since there is limited natural recharge or sustained yield, and water quality is variable and in most areas brackish. Large scale development may have to be coupled with desalination and a recharge program,"* with an added footnote defining "long-term" and "large-scale".

The WF agreed they can live with this wording. The wording will be up for adoption at the next meeting.

Action: Increase Water Supply, Groundwater Development, Additional Specific Findings and Recommendations, Groundwater Development, East Mesa bullet, p 4 will be updated to:

¹ Matt was quoting secondary drinking water standards for TDS. Summary of available data for the East Mesa can be found in *Draft IID Plan*, Appendix B - Groundwater Development and Recharge Potential for the Imperial Valley (Imperial Irrigation District (IID)).

*Without additional groundwater studies, East Mesa groundwater development on a large scale may not be sustainable over the long-term since there is limited natural recharge or sustained yield, and water quality is variable and in most areas brackish. Large scale development may have to be coupled with desalination and a recharge program. Suggested text will be up for adoption at the next WF meeting (**Water Forum**).*

Daniel Gomez, of USFWS Sonny Bono Salton Sea National Wildlife Refuge, said that the main point of the statement is it's unsustainable because of limited natural recharge. Anisa said the brackish water is the problem. Rodney Williams disagreed with the findings and added that the basin is a pressurized system under ground with unknown characteristics at this time. It was agreed that this topic will be revisited at the next meeting.

Fourth comment: Increase Water Supply, Recycled Municipal Water, Additional Findings and Recommendations, bullet 3, p 7. Suggested text:

Require mitigation for loss of flows to IID drains and to the New and Alamo Rivers through development of a regional mitigation bank; seek to provide regional benefits, creating partnerships and meet multiple IRWMP goals by using reclaimed wastewater or desalinated water for this purpose where cost effective and timely.

Charlene suggested the word "require" be changed because CEQA will analyze the effect. Tina suggested "require mitigation if appropriate" Charlene said required mitigation of CEQA analysis requires there's a significant impact. Edie said CEQA is also required to look at cumulative impacts. There has to be more than just a single project analysis.

Matt said that if water is taken out of the drains for recycling and desalinizing, there will be effects that must be recognized. The WF should streamline this into a regional process, so individual projects aren't held up and impacts ignored. Tom said that CEQA will refuse a blanket environmental requirement. Anisa suggested the language include "for state and federal requirements." Matt agreed that Anisa's statement should work. Tom suggested "for CEQA and NEPA requirements, mitigate as needed," but it was agreed that CEQA isn't always necessary, therefore the WF agreed to use Anisa's addition. Tom and Charlene requested to see the new language before it is brought back to the WF. Anisa also suggested it include "and other waterways." Comments should be sent to Anisa by April 14.

Action: Email new Recycled Municipal Water language to Anisa by April 14, ajdivine@iid.com; Anisa will forward language to WF (**WF & Anisa**).

Action: Change Increase Water Supply, Recycled Municipal Water, Additional Findings and Recommendations, bullet 3, p 7 text to "*Require mitigation for state and federal requirements for loss of flows to IID drains and to the New and Alamo Rivers and other waterways through development of a regional mitigation bank...*" (**Matt**).

Fifth comment: Increase Water Supply, Desalination, Political Acceptability, Interregional bullet, p 9. Suggested text:

Interregional interests may be willing and able to subsidize groundwater banking and storage projects for a percentage of the yield. That would lessen interregional political opposition; however any project that includes out of basin water transfers will not be part of this IRWMP.

Tom requested this statement also be removed. The WF agreed by consensus to remove this language.

Decision: Remove entire Increase Water Supply, Desalination, Political Acceptability, Interregional, p 9 bullet.

Sixth comment: Increase Water Supply, Conveyance – Regional/local, CALFED, Large Interregional Conveyance, first open bullet, p 11. Suggested text:

IRWMP Objectives – Large interregional conveyance coupled with water quality treatment could meet IRWMP goals and objectives, but the current cost estimates are higher than any current users would be willing to pay in the near-term. A large interregional conveyance designed primarily for the restoration of the Salton Sea is beyond the scope of this IRWMP.

The WF agreed by consensus to update the Conveyance text.

Decision: Update suggested language for Increase Water Supply, Conveyance – Regional/local, CALFED, Large Interregional Conveyance, first open bullet, p 11: *IRWMP Objectives – Large interregional conveyance coupled with water quality treatment could meet IRWMP goals and objectives, but the current cost estimates are higher than any current users would be willing to pay in the near-term. A large interregional conveyance designed primarily for the restoration of the Salton Sea is beyond the scope of this IRWMP.*

Seventh comment: Reduce Water Demand - Urban Water Efficiency RMS Findings, Urban Demand Management Recommendations, UWC 2, p 3. Suggested text:

Water Forum and Cities should coordinate the 2010 UWMP updates.

The WF agreed by consensus to update the Urban Water Use Efficiency text.

Decision: Adopt suggested language for Reduce Water Demand - Urban Water Efficiency Findings, Urban Demand Management Recommendations, UWC 2, p 3: *Water Forum and Cities should coordinate the 2010 UWMP updates.*

Eighth comment: Table 1 RMS, Increase Water Supply, - Conjunctive Management & Groundwater Storage RMS. Suggested text:

Groundwater banking is the IRWMP number one priority to maximize IID's annual water supply entitlement and minimize under runs.

Jim asked if this language refers only to groundwater banking in the Imperial County. Matt responded that it does not necessarily limit the region to Imperial County groundwater banking. If there are other areas where it is cost effective to bank water, then the IRWM Plan should not preclude it. Jim asked if

wording should be added to give preference to Imperial County groundwater banking projects. Tina stated that she is not opposed to out of region groundwater banking, and when the projects are submitted, the WF can decide if interregional groundwater projects are better. For the time being, the WF should leave the goals big and broad.

The WF agreed by consensus to update the Tables 1 RMS text.

Decision: Adopt suggested language for Tables 1 RMS, Increase Water Supply, Conjunctive Management & Groundwater Storage: *Groundwater banking is the IRWMP number one priority to maximize IID's annual water supply entitlement and minimize under runs.*

Ninth comment: Reduce Water Demand – Agricultural Water Use, Findings, Table 1, p 2. Anisa explained changes. The voluntary fallowing max yield number was changed from 100,000 AFY to 60,000 AFY to be more accurate. Rodney added that a fallowing program is one of the most detrimental things for the Imperial Valley. Anisa said the Farm Bureau has voiced concern about possible impacts of the Blythe's fallowing program. Anisa said that she had not had time to call the Blythe Chamber of Commerce to discuss the impacts of fallowing. The cost of fallowing remains at \$500/AF.

Rodney added that the IID should move away from the fallowing program because of significant impacts to the communities in the Imperial Valley, citing impacts in PVID. Al Kalin added that the IID/SDCWA Transfer Agreement fallowing program will end in 2017, but the Imperial Valley is also expected to implement conservation measures between now and then. Al believes there is a real problem with the amount of money needed to be spent to conserve that water and meet the QSA requirements.

Action: Add to the Ag Water Use Efficiency RMS, Table 1 - Table Notes: *Mitigation requirements (community impacts, environmental impacts, etc) for these water sources are unknown. (Matt)*

Regarding voluntary fallowing, Anisa suggested that the time limit would be short-term or interim. Spencer suggested the language include that voluntary fallowing should only be considered if all other options were not viable. In the case that fallowing is economical, the fallowing program should be given a firm end date.

Tina noted that a lot of people agree with Rodney's concerns. In terms of water sources available, fallowing is a possibility that cannot be ignored. Fallowing may not be cost-effective, but the IRWM Plan should recognize it is an option.

Linsey Dale stated that the Farm Bureau is not endorsing fallowing and that the WF should identify the impacts to the community. She added that this region is not up to par on its system conservation upgrade, and the deadline is quickly approaching. The Farm Bureau recognizes that fallowing cannot be taken off the list because it is an option, but perhaps the region can increase system conservation.

Tom Topuzes suggested the table say "temporary fallowing" instead of "voluntary fallowing". Linsey suggested "temporary voluntary fallowing", which the WF agreed to.

Action: Change Reduce Water Demand – Agricultural Water Use, Findings, Table 1, 9th row, wording to say “temporary voluntary fallowing” (**Matt**).

Rodney felt this wording would allow IID to prolong the fallowing program. Tina stated that the IID Board of Directors is on record as not being an advocate of more fallowing. System Conservation will be a topic on the IID Board of Directors’ April meeting agenda.

Anisa reported that the acreage for voluntary fallowing production was changed to 12 KAC.

Linsey asked if the WF will address the subsidence issue. Dale responded that it will be addressed at a future meeting because the issue does not affect the RMS findings.

Dale announced that the Energy Water Use Efficiency findings will be discussed at the April 21 WF. Charlene said she would email comments on specific changes. Matt suggested a workshop be held to discuss the Energy Water Use Efficiency findings. Anisa suggested April 20, 2011 at 10:00 AM. Matt added that an advanced teleconference might be necessary. The WF decided the April 20, 2011 meeting would be better than a teleconference. Matt suggested the workshop include CalEnergy, Energy Source, Ormat, and IVEDC, and possibly other key stakeholders such as agriculture. Larry Grogan suggested IID and the county attend also as policy issues arise. Matt added that the topic might require more meetings.

Larry stated that California Division of Oil and Gas is in charge of subsidence and Ag would notice subsidence when or after it happens. The question is how to fix subsidence issues; what would go into monitoring systems? If it gets too expensive, then the industry won’t build.

Charlene asked if these findings are based on the subcontractor work product (IEC, Updated *Draft IID Plan, Appendix L Imperial Irrigation District Power Plant Water Use Evaluation*, January 25, 2010). Matt said yes. Charlene stated that Ormat provided comments and tried to meet with IEC to correct the errors in their information to no avail. Ormat has no idea where IEC got the information.

Dale announced that Anisa will attend this Energy workshop, the suggested stakeholders will be contacted, and any other interested parties are welcome to attend.

Dale announced that the DAC Needs Assessment Technical Memorandum received no new comments. The WF accepted it as is by consensus.

Decision: Adopt TM on DAC Needs Assessment Technical Memorandum as is.

Tina said that IID is working with county to create coordinated land use/water supply framework, but will need more time to discuss. Tina suggested that others participate in the Policy WG and email suggestions. The name of the WG will be changed to remove the word “Policy”.

Projects Work Group Summary

Tom Sephton summarized the previous day’s Project WG meeting. Matt announced that one project has been submitted thus far, and expects more to come as the deadline nears. Forms are posted online. The process of ranking the projects or who ranks the projects has not been decided yet. The projects might

be ranked by a panel of experts, a panel of stakeholders without projects submitted, or the Imperial IRWMP can use outside expertise for ranking. A project can be submitted at any stage of readiness, but only shovel ready projects can qualify for CDWR grant money.

There was discussion on how stormwater is dealt with. Facility impacts and damage from storm water that enters the drains was discussed. Changes to draft criteria will be made by the Projects WG and will ultimately be voted on by the WF for acceptance. The WG discussed new water users, such as geothermal, paying very high rates, which they believe to be uneconomically priced. The problem revolves around new water costing more than Colorado River water that has been used for years. Anisa summarized by saying that the ranking system is an issue of balancing priority, volume of water, cost of water, who pays for water, and is the project shovel ready.

Anna verified definitions and the process for ranking projects for CDWR. A sample project that will be submitted by Imperial was discussed: a wastewater treatment plant off Keystone Road. The strongest comment was that urban wastewater recycling integrated with stormwater control was proposed to water a golf course, which was not considered the best use of that water. Another sample project discussed was a high saline groundwater basin in North County could be purified by using wasted heat and exchanged with local farms. Discussion quickly deviated to purple pipe, wastewater, and farmers not being interested in using that water because of market issues with wastewater on crops.

Matt explained the “in lieu of” concept, which is a way of promoting recycled wastewater in lieu of Colorado River water. The concept will be discussed further.

Matt added that the WF will have to define how often the IRWM Plan should be updated.

Matt said once the Projects WG has created the ranking process, and projects are submitted, the WG will bring back the *sieve* that the WF can run each project through. Anisa said she sent out the first draft of the criteria. The glitches in the submittal forms have been fixed. If the form malfunctions, please contact Anisa.

Next Steps

Anisa announced that the PMT will create a presentation about the IRWMP’s progress for each stakeholder to present to their boards. IID staff will be available to go with any presenter if assistance is requested. The presentation will be available in May. The WF’s May meeting is cancelled to allow for stakeholders to connect with their groups and to evaluate how future land use and water supply can be balanced. The IID and County will use this time to finalize and streamline their land use changes policy.

Andy Horne requested that the May WF meeting be held if Imperial County and IID are ready to proceed with a coordinated land use/water supply strategy.

Tina remarked that stakeholder representatives should report IRWM Plan progress to their boards/constituencies in the same way that the stakeholder representatives should report their constituencies’ needs to the Forum. She noted that the boards and constituencies of each stakeholder

should be kept informed throughout this process to eliminate any surprises when this plan is ready to be adopted.

- April 20: Energy Workshop @ 10:00-12:00 am.
- April 20: Projects WG @ 1:30-3:30 pm.
- April 21: Water Forum Meeting.
- May 19: Water Forum Meeting (tentative).
- June 16: Water Forum Meeting.

Policy WG- will not meet on April 20 and name will be changed.

The next WF meeting will include adopting the comments that were not adopted at this meeting, reviewing the preliminary project list, a presentation from County on its process for approving a change of land use for projects, and a presentation from IID on its process for approving water use projects.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:08 am.