



IMPERIAL IRWMP

Water Forum Meeting Notes

ImperialIRWMP.org

Date: Thursday, February 17, 2011

Time: 9:00–11:30 noon

Location: SDG&E

Participants: See the attached sign in sheet.

Follow-up Actions

- Update Increase Water Supply, p 7 “Additional Findings and Recommendations” Bullet 3, “Require mitigation for loss of flows to IID drains...” to include mitigation for the New River and Alamo River. (**Matt Zidar**)
- Email written comments on Increase Water Supply, Reduce Water Demand and DAC Needs Technical Memo be emailed to her by Friday, February 25, at ajdivine@IID.com. (**Stakeholders and Interested Parties**)
- At request of Andy Horne, Matt Zidar to confer with Rodney Williams to review East Mesa data and any other new information. (**Matt Zidar, Rodney Williams**)
- Schedule with Luis Olmedo offline meeting to discuss further outreach to the DACs (**Dale Schafer**)
- Schedule outreach to build consensus so the IRWMP approval process goes smoothly. (**PMT with Stakeholder support**)
- Reschedule DAC Workshop (**PMT**)
- Schedule an algae farm teleconference (**Matt**)
- Schedule Demand Management WG meeting to discuss Energy WUE Findings, preferably before March 23 (**Matt**)

Summary of Decisions

No decisions were made by the Water Forum at this meeting.

Meeting Notes

Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review, November Meeting Notes

Dale Schafer called the meeting to order at 9:13 am, and reviewed the agenda. Dale announced that the Water Forum would attempt to adopt the resource management strategies today.

Current Events – Stakeholder News, CDWR Report and Project Status Report

Anna Aljabiry (CDWR) announced that Imperial’s Proposition 84 Planning Grant application, submitted in the fall, is on the desk of the director of CDWR and can be expected to be signed today, with a final announcement as early as February 18th or the following week.

CDWR is in the process of reviewing Proposition 84 Implementation Grants submitted for Round 1. This should be completed by the end of April. At this time there is no date for Round 2 and there will not be a final date release until the first round is completed.

Dale suggested that the Imperial IRWMP should be ready for the second round of implementation grant funding since the submittal date will likely be delayed.

New River Improvement Project

Luis introduced Jose Angel, Assistant Executive Officer for the Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board. Jose Angel he is the official spokesperson for the New River Improvement Project.

Jose Angel spoke about the New River Improvement Project and noted that it is important is to coordinate potential impacts the IRWMP implementation and planning process will have on the river and to introduce the project to the IRWMP work groups. The New River Improvement Project receives Prop 84 funding, and the group has about \$36,000 saved for the project as of date.

The New River is part of what the Regional Board has prioritized as the number 1 watershed in this region that needs cleaning. The New River gets a lot of Mexicali's drainage and contains some of the most impaired water in the region. The river starts approximately 20 miles south of the border in the Mexicali Valley. About 60% of the water flowing across the border is a return flow from the Mexicali Valley farms, mainly tailwater. Assemblyman Perez signed Assembly Bill 1079 into law in 2009, which required the California-Mexico Border Relations Council of California and Mexico to prepare a strategic plan for a New River cleanup project and which provided for a technical advisory committee (TAC). The legislation described exactly what the strategic plan should contain. The plan must contain the following:

- Quantify current and projected New River water quality impairments and the flows.
- Prioritization of the actions necessary to protect public health and to meet new river water quality objectives and other environmental goals, such a improving the quality of water flows into the Salton Sea.
- Identification of potential funds for the implementation of the project, and potential lead agencies that would be responsible for environmental review of activities related to the cleanup and restoration of the New River.
- Plan for a river parkway.

The TAC has 22 stakeholders. The initial strategy was to complete the plan by next year, but that was too ambitious. The legislation set aside \$800,000 from Prop 84 for funding, but since there was no bond sale, the project had to find money elsewhere. This is the first time that the state has specifically allocated money to the New River in the Imperial Valley. The problems are impairments from pathogens, nutrients, pesticides, metals, and trash. Other factors that complicate the plan include multiple agencies along the river and a large number of stakeholders.

Sources of pollutions from Mexico include raw sewage and a lack of remediation projects. The river used to carry 10-20 million gallons of raw sewage; however, new treatment facilities, funded by both countries are now fully functioning. These were funded through the North American Development Bank (NADBank) - a binational organization created by North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and Border Environment Cooperation Commission (BECC), NADBank's sister institution – which is responsible for certifying that the projects meet a series of environmental criteria and qualify for funding.

Mexicali II Wastewater Treatment Plant has been built, but the river remains polluted. Pollution problems were identified at the work group level. The Remediation work group is identifying potential remediation project concepts and developing the strategic plan. Legislation requires the problem be addressed from Mexico to the Salton Sea. Possible improvements include farming community implementing BMPs, and potential wetlands projects to address nutrient and silt problems. The cost to create a wastewater treatment plant at the border would be about \$1.2-1.3 billion. Whatever ideas are developed have to be realistic and fundable. The Remediation work group is expected to complete its draft plan by August 2011. The group will hold public meetings for public input and to describe the New River's status on February 23 and 24, and will be advertised throughout the Imperial Valley and in newspapers.

- Jose Angel is happy to answer any questions - phone: 916-324-2458
- Further information can be found at: www.calepa.ca.gov/border/newriver

Matt asked how loss of flow to the New River is dealt with. Jose explained that casing a section of the river and treating that water (piping the river in the Calexico area) would affect the hydraulics. Any drop in volume has a significant impact because the water is shallow. Flows have decreased by about 25 per cent. He stated that it would be more beneficial for the region to not have any flow at the border, but that would destroy Mexicali. The cost of a large pumping station at the border would be around \$300 million, and would require Mexicali to redesign its sewer and drainage system, which isn't feasible. The flow is expected to decrease by another 25 per cent in the coming years.

Andy Horne asked if the Imperial IRWMP and New River Improvement Project were seeking money from the same pot, pointing out the importance of coordination. A New River water treatment facility would fit IRWMP goals and objectives if the opportunity exists. Jose agreed with Andy, and noted that water management is the main purpose of Prop 84. Jose added that the New River Improvement Project can't receive Prop 84 funding unless they're part of a regional plan, so they will have to merge with the planning and implementation aspects of the IRWMP.

Armando Villa, Imperial County Planning and Development Services Director, said he didn't see water projects to include cleaning Mexico's water. Jose advised that this project will provide ecological values down-stream, and the water could then be seen as a resource instead of a problem. Andy added that the water could be used for cooling towers at power plants.

Matt said the IRWMP will compare the current and future conditions of water supply and demand with and without the IRWMP. The IRWMP is trying to find the gap between supply and demand and determine water budget effects. Assumptions can be made once regional inflows are determined.

Drainage and Salton Sea flows should be analyzed, because a potential reduction of 75,000 acre-feet of flow from Mexico will have a large impact on the region and water budget.

Jose Angel restated that Prop 84 has a section on water quality, and that is the direction the New River Improvement Project is taking. Carl Stills suggested the Salton Sea effects should be mitigated since a reduction of New River water flows will have an effect on playa exposure. Carl believes playa exposure mitigation should be included in the IRWMP's scope. If the prime focus is on air quality mitigation, then it will have to be explained another way or it won't be eligible for this grant opportunity. Tom Sephton suggested this project can be worded for eligibility.

Jose informed the Water Forum that the New River project has taken a direct approach for the Salton Sea and has a restoration plan in place. Enhancing the Salton Sea has a positive impact on the region, and there is good information concerning Colorado River flows that will continue to provide farming in the Imperial Valley. The project team recognizes that any changes made to inflow at the border will have significant impacts on the communities along the New River. For recreational purposes, the state sees no difference between the New River and the Sacramento River, both highly polluted bodies of water. Luis said the Salton Sea is a bigger issue than the Water Forum can handle at the moment, and proposed an additional management group meeting to discuss this idea specifically to give this project a proper opportunity.

Action: Dale proposed an offline meeting to discuss further outreach to the DACs.

Al Kalin reminded the group that as farmers are asked to be more efficient with water use, drain flows will decrease, resulting in a concentration of poor water quality flowing in the New River and Salton Sea. Jose Angel emphasized that conservation techniques are a balancing act. The quantity of water makes a substantial difference on characteristics of runoff; and if we clean it too well, Los Angeles will try harder to get water rights. We should look at the issues that dry out the valley, in particular, Ag use. The New River Improvement Project is looking for a plan that is viable and affordable. The region must reach consensus; and, for the first time, we have the opportunity to develop a plan without over resourcing the region.

Urban Water Management Plan Meeting Report

Ruben Mireles, Brawley's Operations Division Manager, updated the Water Forum on the UWMP meeting. The group discussed the importance of developing a UWMP and suggested that demand management measures should be more descriptive. New requirements for UWMP were briefly explained, and must be met for the Imperial Proposition 84 Implementation grant applicant to be eligible for state funding. Few cities were aware of the new level of detail required for a UWMP. The group also discussed UWMP methods required by CDWR and those used in the IRWMP. Cities in the region will have to conserve 20% of their water use by the year 2020, and each UWMP should seek to define those savings. Ag will implement BMPs from the Definite Plan; cities will implement demand management measures as defined by the Urban Water Conservation Council and the State. Cities will now be required to report when they're implementing these practices, giving explanations when they're

not. The region will have to work together and coordinate how this 20% reduction goal will be met. It was concluded that each city will continue to create its own UWMP.

Jose Angel noted that 20% is the objective, but that it's a balancing act. He explained that there's a population of about 2,300 in the High Valley, yet it's probably the most water efficient area he's seen. This area's conservation and efficiency efforts have produced brine-like water, which was an unexpected consequence of the conservation. He noted that it is important to be mindful of water quality impacts, as there's a nexus in water resource management that requires balancing environmental impacts.

RMS Scoping Findings

Dale noted that the Water Forum needs to adopt RMS scoping findings. At this meeting, the RMSs associated with the Increase Water Supply management objective were addressed. Dale noted that the Groundwater Storage RMS was presented at the November 2010 WF meeting and adopted at the January 20, 2011 WF meeting. Scoping findings for Desalinization RMS (discussed in November) and Recycled Municipal Water RMS (discussed in December) were to be adopted at this meeting, but the Water Forum had comments and recommended changes, so neither Desalinization RMS nor Recycled Municipal Wastewater RMS scoping findings was adopted.

Tom Sephton commented on the *Draft for Forum Adoption Increase Water Supply* document:

Require mitigation for loss of flows to IID drains through development of a regional mitigation bank; seek to provide regional benefits, creating partnerships and meet multiple IRWMP goals by using reclaimed wastewater for this purpose where cost effective and timely. (p 7, last sq. bullet)

Tom asked why loss of flow to the New River and Alamo River were not considered; they were specifically mentioned in the adopted Groundwater Storage RMS. He asked if this exclusion was accidental or intentional.

Matt responded that the language is an oversight and will be updated. He added that this Recycle Municipal Wastewater RMS deals with a relatively small volume of flow and that the WF recognizes that the Salton Sea requires much larger restoration plans than the IRWMP scope. The Water Forum has also identified that recycling municipal wastewater is important for the region as a near-term project.

Tom asked if the IRWMP intends to ignore impacts to the rivers. Matt responded that the language will be updated to include the rivers. Matt added that he trusts the agencies' opinions and abilities to evaluate and mitigate impacts in their EIRs for recycled water facilities. The IRWMP process is bringing together projects from the cities. Cities need to mitigate for loss of drain flow, so that they don't externalize these impacts and their costs. There could be a cooperative effort for mitigating the reduced flows on IID drains and the two rivers. We also recognize that the Salton Sea's impacts cannot be ignored in the long-term.

Action: Update Recycle Municipal Wastewater page 7 "Additional Findings and Recommendations" Bullet 3 to include mitigation for the New River and Alamo River.

Tom commented on two separate sections of Increase Water Supply Scoping Findings document pertaining to Political Acceptability of Groundwater Banking and Desalinization (pages 4 and 9). In the desalinization section, Tom would like the wording to portray that the current focus of the IRWMP is to benefit *this* region, not outside areas. But, he noted, the Projects Work Group had not decided to close that door.

Matt noted that interregional projects could help in the future, if local costs are higher than the region can afford. The Water Forum has stated that it is necessary to solve the region's problems first with capital projects and policy. The preliminary finding was made that no transfers out of the Region will be part of the IRWMP at this time, but it could be recognized as a long-term option (Table 2).

Tom noted that there are agencies that can pay and are willing to pay for water, and asked where the document mentions the future possibility of a water transfer and the current focus on only internal use. Matt pointed to Table 1 of the WF handout which indicates which RMS are and are not doable in the Imperial Region. These findings are also in our WF and WG minutes.

Dale pointed out that Table 2 is for RMS no longer considered, including out-of-basin transfers not being part of IRWMP; she noted, however, that the WF has not taken a formal position on this as yet.

Edith Harmon reported that after the January 2011 WF meeting, litigation was filed against the county pertaining mostly to East Mesa groundwater use. Two separate lawsuits were filed on January 25 or 26, 2011.

Jose Angel noted that CDWR has provided guidelines and policies that must be followed. A number of responsible agencies have weighed into the process.

Matt noted that, when proposals are looked at, the Water Forum will determine to what extent the project conflicts with other state policies and compliance requirements (e.g., the QSA/Transfer Agreements, Salton Sea restoration effort); however, the Water Forum should focus on the scope of work for the IRWMP, which does not include the Salton Sea, and on projects that will be grant eligible.

Armando requested a wording change, noting that a Groundwater Management Plan is necessary, but the complexities of jurisdiction authority must be resolved.

Matt responded that the RAP document, *Draft IID Plan* and IRWMP make explicit that two sponsoring agencies, Imperial County and IID, are in charge of water management, while the Cities are responsible for the management of treated water and municipal wastewater. The basis of the WF is the County's authority over groundwater and IID's authority for managing Colorado River water supplies and the Cities' authority as water purveyors.

Rodney Williams remarked that he understood the reasoning behind Table 2, but asked if this document would limit the IID from renegotiating the QSA in the event it is invalidated. Tina explained that the WF can't worry about or wait for the QSA to be determined. The IRWMP is building on QSA assumptions; looking at other projects and other water management opportunities.

Rodney asked why the IRWMP would limit individuals with their personal property. There is a law, of inverse condemnation; if the WF sets up policy creating a system that doesn't allow individuals do with their property what is in their best interest, the WF will be attacked. Rodney stated that individual rights will be brought forward. Tina explained that an IRWMP is for a regional plan to get funding for public agency-sponsored projects and doesn't preclude individuals from doing what they want with their property. The IRWMP will follow the law.

Rodney said if that's the case then the IRWMP doesn't need to include this statement. Tina replied that the WF decided an interregional transfer is not something they want to consider at this time. The Water Forum will be prioritizing projects according to how well they meet Imperial Region goals and objectives and help the Region access state grant funding.

Rodney suggested that this document could become the basis for a groundwater plan or water regulations in this county. Tina responded that it doesn't have that intent unless the agency with the appropriate authority adopts the plan and subsequent policies or regulation.

Rodney commented on the East Mesa policy, located on page 4 of the Increase Water Supply document:

East Mesa groundwater development would not be sustainable over the long term since there is no natural recharge or sustained yield, and water quality is limited.

- *Groundwater in storage in the East Mesa is the result of the leakage from the historic operations of the irrigation canals.*
- *East Mesa groundwater development coupled with desalination of the brackish groundwater would take advantage of water in storage, but would still result in depletion of groundwater over time unless integrated with strategies to recharge and store Colorado River water.*

Rodney believes these points to be false, and could provide proof. Matt said all documents he'd reviewed supported the preliminary findings, but was willing to view information provided by Rodney. Matt added that a lot of questions and uncertainty remain about the East Mesa due to a lack of information.

Edith stated that as a groundwater user of West Mesa, she is aware of county's long standing problems with the East Mesa. She said there is a very big difference between West and East groundwater. If one individual wants to use a large quantity of water, it will have significant impacts on other users and property rates. West Mesa has limited recharge; therefore, when the groundwater is gone, it's gone (suggested by USGS reports). Edith supports the concept of protecting the local water supplies for use in the Region; otherwise, coastal areas that have more money will take the water. If the water can be moved, then this area's political power might shift lower on the totem pole.

Rodney quoted the section stating "groundwater banking and storage of underruns should be the highest priority for the Water Forum and IRWMP." He agreed with Edith on the potential for more wealthy areas to want our groundwater. Rodney suggested the county should consider focusing more on unexplored potential groundwater sites, so the Region can produce water for MWD when they come

back for more in the future. Rodney believes other areas in our region have potential groundwater development.

Matt said groundwater development implies that there is naturally occurring recharge. He noted that that natural recharge is needed, or groundwater development will deplete groundwater storage and have negative impacts. The IRWWMP goal is to develop a public supply of water for the long term, so the East Mesa's limited yield and expected poor quality water limit groundwater development. The county is projecting an increase demand of 180,000 AF per year for renewable energy by 2050 (according to the County General Plan). The question is how to meet this forecasted demand. The region could develop new supplies (Increase Water Supply), make better use of the existing supply (Reduce Water Use) or apportion water among uses (Practice Resources Stewardship).

Matt explained that groundwater recharge is different from groundwater development, and noted that the WF number one priority is storing Colorado River water to make full use of IDI's the Colorado River water right. He noted the County has authority over groundwater and, if the county wants to accept overdraft and mining of groundwater, the County can do that as long as other groundwater users don't challenge the decision. Matt noted that the county has authority to say whether groundwater could be exported, but opined that the existing ordinance limits export of groundwater.

Matt concluded that further groundwater development for public purposes in the IRWMP is off the table since there is very limited safe yield. He noted that Rodney and others have the right as individuals to pursue a groundwater project for their overlying land uses, but developing local groundwater either for export or to meet the forecasted future demands was not viewed as viable by those on the Consulting Team who did the review. If groundwater storage and recharge could be combined, that would be viable.

Spencer Eldred of Scripps Institution of Oceanography remarked that there seems to be no finding on mixing desalinized and brackish water. He suggested that references to algae farms using potable water should include discussion of how brackish and poor quality water can be used on some crops and to produce algae.

Matt responded that the agriculture community was asked if it would be possible to pump and blend brackish groundwater in the East Highline or All-American Canal and Ag disapproved since it would reduce water quality and could affect crops. The *Draft IDI Plan* looked at pumping and blending brackish groundwater at the request of Director Hanks. Growers said more water would be required due to an increase of salts. The IRWMP will include the Matching Water Quality to Use RMS, for example, use of recycled wastewater on certain fiber crops or using brackish drain or groundwater for algae production.

Dale announced that neither Desalinization RMS nor Recycled Municipal Wastewater RMS Findings would be adopted at this meeting.

Action: Email written comments on Increase Water Supply, Reduce Water Demand and DAC Needs Technical Memo to Anisa Divine by Friday, February 25, at ajdivine@IID.com.

Al Kalin noted that it is important to look at groundwater banking development and pumping with caution. The Imperial Valley has a functioning system of drains, canals, and tile drainage lines engineered with specific slopes. The current groundwater levels shouldn't be altered too much so that the drainage system continues to work. Al suggested the Groundwater Management Plan include a clause that addresses this issue.

Dale said that people concerned with groundwater could form and participate in a Groundwater WG.

Carl Stills agreed with Tom that the section on Political Acceptability should be reworded for consensus, because its current wording could be misleading. He said he would email suggestions to Anisa. Tom added that only a few changes are necessary, and that it would be good to see these types of projects submitted.

Matt said this dialogue is a healthy part of the process. He encouraged comments be submitted in writing. Matt asked that stakeholders report the changes to the group they represent and seek additional comment.

Andy Horne commented that excluding water transfers from the IRWMP could be perceived as overly restrictive. It could confuse the process when transfers do eventually get on the table. Andy felt it would be easy to add a caveat to limit jurisdictions of individual agencies and authority, perhaps clarification on the section stating, "... strictly for funding or purposes of the grant." Matt responded that strictly focusing IRWMP findings on obtaining grant funds could reduce the chance of being awarded the grant.

Andy said if the caveat were not added, this document could be interpreted as a policy statement limiting agencies authorities and the ability to transfer or adopt related policy. If there can be a groundwater transfer that passes environmental standards, then it's something this region would be foolish to preclude itself from doing in the future. Matt responded that the IRWMP is not intended in any way to restrict an agency's legal authority and that a statement to this effect would be put up front in the IRWMP. The IRWMP seeks to harness existing agency authorities and get everyone going in the same direction.

Action: Andy requested that Matt confer with Rodney to review East Mesa data and any other new information. Andy said that if the WF challenges the factual statements of this document, then it should be reviewed.

Matt said the purpose of the review of the Resources Management Strategies has been to focus the IRWMP (scoping) and develop findings to guide the subsequent efforts, establish priorities and define which strategies are not worth the Water Forum's time or further consideration due to uncertainty, lack of information, political acceptability, etc. The *Draft IID Plan* and RAP explain this process. The findings outline the strategies at a conceptual level, defining how they can be integrated and helping to provide a foundation for development of specific regional projects.

Kevin Kelly added that from IID's and possibly the county's perspective, the agencies would like to extend the available water supply and hopefully create new water. Nothing in this plan should preclude an individual from pursuing his own interest or exercising their private property rights. If the plan doesn't include groundwater projects, then IID feels it's a mistake.

Edith said a majority of eastern county land is managed by BLM and they will also have jurisdiction.

Anna said the dialogue is normal and healthy; and excluding San Diego, all other regions have differing levels of conflicts. CDWR requires IRWMPs because it was realized that they were receiving applications from several projects that were almost identical and from agencies working on overlapping areas. More than once in the past, CDWR received applications targeting the same area and project concepts, with two or more scoring high in the review process, but the state couldn't fund the same project twice, so CDWR had to coordinate those agencies.

To avoid this type of competition in a region, CDWR developed the IRWMP process; but initially some agencies didn't know how to get through the conflicts in their region, because CDWR did not have a policy for how these regions would work together. CDWR created the Regional Acceptance Process (RAP) encouraging agencies across the state to coordinate, create boundaries, and resolve conflicts before the state has to get involved. The goal is to solve the problems locally. This implementation grant is only the beginning; therefore, if your project is not ready for the first round, there will be future rounds for Prop 84 and more programs in the future.

Dale reminded the Water Forum to review the Scoping Findings for Increase Water Supply and for Reduce Water Demand, and email comments and questions to Anisa by the 25th of February. The Project Management Team will review the emails, and possibly discuss in a work group.

Matt reminded the Water Forum that the Scoping Findings are only a small part of the IRWMP and that the purpose is to realistically prioritize strategies and projects. If the Water Forum can't overcome a conflict, that strategy will be put aside for this version of the IRWMP.

Stakeholders and interested parties may want to review the Imperial RAP (April 2009), which is online at the Imperial IRWMP website (<http://imperialirwmp.org/>).

Anisa added that there is a button called "Adopted Documents" which includes the Imperial Region RAP, Charter, and Goals and Objectives.

Preliminary Call for Projects

Matt reported that the project submittal process was discussed at a workshop the previous day. Stakeholders are encouraged to submit projects that meet the Imperial Region goals and objectives. The window for submitting projects runs through March 31, 2011, and the project list will be compiled and brought to the Water Forum in April.

Initially, the project list will not be ranked. The next step is to develop the project review and evaluation criteria. The Projects WG and PMT will review and discuss draft project evaluation criteria,

which will be brought to the Water Forum for action. The Projects WG will meet on Wednesday, March 23, and WF on Thursday, March 24 1:30-3:30 at SDG&E.

Disadvantaged Communities Update

The DAC workshop will be rescheduled. Luis Olmedo reported on conversation and outreach to DACs. Initially, there was support from groups that work with DACs, but there's a subgroup of communities that have not communicated with and do not participate mostly because of their lack of understanding of government or limited time to participate (short staff, no funding, busy schedules, etc.). Luis tried to contact cities to help them during the 'Call for Projects' and encourage they come to the workshops. He noted that many communities don't understand the process.

One city thought the IRWMP was about regulation. Luis is concerned that the Water Forum hasn't accepted the severity of the DAC's limited resources and their inability to realize the IRWMP opportunities. There are projects that can align well with their needs and the IRWMP. Luis asked that the group try harder to obtain DAC support, because what the Water Forum thinks is priority, might not be the priority for the larger population of DACs. Luis stated that the Water Forum needs to realize that DACs are being left behind.

Action: Dale proposed an offline meeting to discuss further outreach to the DACs.

Carl Stills asked if there is a communication plan for the outreach. Not just for the approval process, but to build consensus so the approval process goes smoothly. Dale explained that Luis is requesting more interaction. Dale asked the WF to explain to those they interact with about what the process can do for them. All cities are welcomed into this process and can be stakeholders.

Action: Outreach to build consensus so the IRWMP approval process goes smoothly. PMT will undertake this activity with Stakeholder support.

Edith said that Calipatria, Bombay Beach, Westmorland, and Ocotillo still have populations that have needs. Anisa responded that Bombay Beach isn't in our region.

Matt noted that meetings were held with each city and with the county to assess stakeholder needs very early in the process. The Consulting Team identified DACs and undertook an initial assessment of communities. More recently, the Consulting Team interviewed staff of the cities and other water purveyors that serve DACs (and the City of Imperial) to document their needs. The findings are presented in the *DAC Needs Technical Memorandum* (Jan 18, 2011), which was included in the materials for this Water Forum meeting. Participation in the IRWM process was solicited from every city, municipality and water agency or company. IID hosted a kick off meeting that was publicly noticed.

To be successful, the entire region must be on board and their needs known. All were invited to the DAC workshop, but the timing didn't work, so the workshop will be rescheduled. There are resolutions from all of the cities and work continues throughout the county to find anyone missed. Dale suggested that all should make a new effort to reach the DACs.

Action: Reschedule DAC Workshop (PMT).

Matt remarked that now that specific projects can be submitted and there is money on the table, maybe this will encourage everyone to get engaged. Edith added that personal contact is often appreciated.

Spencer recommended that participants read documents and email comments when traveling to attend a meeting isn't possible. The comments can then be read and discussed at the meetings.

Matt recommended an improved website with a mechanism for communication.

Next Steps

The call for project submittals is open from now into March 31, 2011. The forms for submitting projects for Water Forum consideration will be posted on the front page of the Imperial IRWMP website.

Spencer asked Matt to form a work group to deal with algae farm topics. Matt agreed to schedule a conference call for now. Andy added that the algae farms will possibly be added to an Ag WG. Anisa, Spencer, and others will talk offline about this suggestion.

Action: Schedule an algae Farm teleconference (Matt)

Andy asked about the adoption of the Energy Water Use Efficiency findings, and Anisa responded that it will be discussed at the next meeting. Larry Grogan believes these findings will require some fine-tuning.

Action: Matt suggested another energy meeting to discuss information on those findings, preferably before March 23.

The Projects Work Group will meet on March 23, 2011

The next WF meeting is March 24, 2011.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:24am.