



IMPERIAL IRWMP

Water Forum Meeting Notes

Date: Thursday, April 19, 2012

Time: 9:00–11:30 am

Location: SDG&E Renewable Energy Center,

Participants

See the attached sign in sheet.

Follow-up Actions

Topic	Action	Follow-Up
Monitoring Links	Send links to the WATER FORUM	Anisa
Project Rankings	Send project ranking list to the PWG.	GEI
Project Rankings	Adoption of project ranking list	Water Forum

Summary of Decisions

No decisions were made at this meeting.

Meeting Notes

Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review, November Meeting Notes

Dale Schafer called the meeting to order at 9:11am. Agenda review. Questions and/or comments can be emailed to Dale Schafer at daleschafer@msn.com or Anisa Divine at ajdivine@iid.com.

Current Events

Temporary Land Conversion Fallowing Policy

Autumn Ashurst presented an update on the IID policy for solar and other project development that takes agricultural land out of production. A water code provision under the terms of QSA expands the definition of fallowing, for water conservation purposes, to include longer term land use projects, such as solar. A finalized version of this policy will be presented to the IID board for action in early May. Direct questions regarding this policy can be addressed to Tina Shields at tlshields@iid.com.

Tom Sephton suggested that the Water Forum review how the TLCFP affects assumptions made in the IRWMP. Tom asked how many agricultural acres will potentially participate in this policy, because it will affect the supply demand imbalance and will require additional CEQA analysis. Andy Horne said the maximum acreage the County has seen in permit applications is about 18,000 acres of ag land. Andy estimates a more realistic number is around 10,000 acres. Andy added that there may be an option to use water under the policy for the CRWDA transfer from IID to Coachella Valley Water District.

Edie Harmon expressed about that the County was rezoning the lands and assuming they will go back to ag. Edie insisted that if there were no intent for future agriculture, then the zoning of the land should be changed because the County’s Conditional Use Permit creates planning problems.

CDWR Update

Anna Aljabiry explained the process for grant financing. CDWR will establish a contract with one entity (the lead agency). The lead agency will establish a contract with each project sponsor. CDWR will not have any contact with project sponsors. Tom asked if the required 90-day financial process has changed. Anna said the process has not changed but requires wet signatures on all invoices. When invoices are sent to Anna, the lead agency should contact Anna so she can notify the mail room that she is expecting mail. Pending City Council approval, the City of Imperial will be the Imperial IRWMP lead agency.

IRWMP Schedule to Completion

Anisa reviewed the schedule to completion, see table below. The IRWMP is not binding on any agency; it is intended to be a roadmap for the region with annual meetings for progress updates and review.

Imperial IRWMP Schedule to Completion

Administrative Draft	04/30/2012
Water Forum – Written Comments Due	05/15/2012
Public Draft	06/01/2012
Public – Written Comments Due	06/15/2012
Water Forum & Public Meeting: Review & Comments	06/28/2012
Final IRWMP (to me emailed to Water Forum)	07/12/2012
Water Forum Adopt Final IRWMP	07/19/2012
Public Agencies Adopt Final IRWMP	07/20–09/07/2012

Both the list of preliminary prioritized projects and list of all submitted projects will be in the IRWMP.

Implementation Plan Overview

Dale gave the Water Forum time to look over the Table of Contents handout. Stakeholders and interested parties volunteered to review various chapters or sections outlined in the attached table, *Imperial IRWMP Table of Contents*. Each chapter or section will be emailed to the respective reviewer with a comment form. Deadline for comments is May 15.

The comment form will be used to unify and consolidate comments by listing page and paragraph numbers. Andy suggested a word document be sent to reviewers instead of pdf.

Charlene Wardlow asked if the Interim Water Supply Policy, adopted by the IID board will go away once the IRWMP is completed. Anisa suggested Charlene contact Tina Shields.

Edie Harmon requested links for state data monitoring. Anna said the CDWR website has not made it easy to find this data; however, she can help Edie with specific requests, should Edie email her. Anna noted that a DAC feature has been added to the CDWR website describing which cities are considered DAC, based on census data. Anna also suggested Edie find a link titled “CASGEM” to find well information. Matt suggested a site called “IRIS” could also help Edie. These links will be sent to Anisa and forwarded to the WATER FORUM.

Action: Send data monitoring links to the WF. (Anisa)

Future IRWMP Activity

Marlene Best reviewed the PMT discussion for the future of the IRWMP. A formal process will be required for significant changes to the IRWMP, while interim changes, such as updates to the project list, can be performed annually. The annual WATER FORUM meeting will most likely be held in March.

There will be performance monitoring to report on projects and regional changes that should be reflected in the IRWMP. The lead agency will assemble annual reports for CDWR that be based on individual project data, and an agency will need funding to collect data for the annual reporting. IID has initially volunteered to manage data with their staff, but may need assistance in the future. IID has also volunteered to offer staff support for on-going IRWMP tasks, although the stakeholders may need to contribute monetarily (the logistics of this will be decided at a future date). Larger jurisdictions have the ability to pay for grant writers, although DAC's will most likely not have funding for this. It was suggested that the grant writing application might be sent out as a Request for Proposal with the proviso that payment is reliant on grant award. Tentative on council approval, the City of Imperial will be the Imperial IRWMP lead agency.

Meg Carroll of Scripps Institution of Oceanography asked when the Prop 84 grant will be completed. The grant application is due in March 2013.

Projects Work Group Report: Ranking for Readiness, Bundling

Tom gave an update on the previous day's PWG meeting, which was primarily about completing the project ranking process. Two additional projects were presented: a Seeley drainage project looking to receive up to \$233,000 from Prop 1E and a City of El Centro potable water intercity pipe connection project costs totaling approximately \$1.4 million.

Following project presentations, the PWG completed review forms and Matt was tasked to tabulate results. The PWG ranked projects based on readiness to proceed including environmental documents and permitting. These scores were added to the GEI project review.

Action: GEI will send the results to the PWG and the list will be up for adoption at the June 2012 Water Forum meeting (GEI, WF).

Tom suggested to the Water Forum that the PWG be given an additional opportunity to review the ranking once GEI completes their calculations. Matt said the ranking will not need to be completed before the completion of the IRWMP final draft because the ranking will be part of the Appendices.

After project review, the PWG discussed regional bundling opportunities. Several projects had similar themes. Seeley and Holtville agreed to discuss bundling their projects. Similarly, El Centro and Brawley agreed to discuss possible bundling opportunities.

There was discussion on the funding limitations. Some projects cost millions of dollars and Anna stated that only \$5.2 million is available during Round Two for the Colorado Region. The realistic dollar amount

available to the Imperial region will be approximately \$2 million. Round Three will have significantly more funding available from CDWR, and Prop 1E is a separate pot of available funding.

The PWG discussed funding possibilities for the grant application process. One idea was charging each project that is selected to be included in the grant application to account for their portion of the requested grant amount. Another idea was charging an application fee to be included in the IRWMP. It was suggested that these ideas might preclude DACs but might be manageable. It was noted that the City of Imperial will be the lead agency for all CDWR contact.

Funding for future IRWMP updates was also discussed. A solution was not determined, but the Water Forum is open to suggestions. Marlene suggested an RFP for a grant writer (discussed earlier).

The meeting was adjourned at 10:50am.