



IMPERIAL IRWMP

imperialirwmp.org

Water Forum Meeting Notes

Date: Thursday, January 20, 2011

Time: 9:00–11:30 noon

Location: SDG&E Renewable Energy Center,

Participants

See the attached sign in sheet.

Follow-up Actions

- Email details on the County's workshop for distribution to the Water Forum (Armando Villa, Anisa).
- Schedule and confirm time on February Water Forum agenda for Jose Angel to discuss the New River Improvement Project (Anisa).
- Complete analysis of RMS for the Practice Resources Stewardship management objective to address land use conversion; bring findings and recommendations for Water Forum discussion (Matt). PMT is to review and decide on establishing a work group.
- Email Invitation for the Preliminary Call for Projects to the Water Forum (Anisa).
- Provide Project Application PDF when complete (Matt)
- Email Project Submittal Workshop announcement (Anisa)
- Add website address to IRWMP headers.
- CDWR link to be added to the IRWMP website and email to Water Forum.
- Improve IRWMP website functionality (Matt, Dale)
- Stakeholder links and/or information to be added to the IRWMP website.

Summary of Decisions

There were no action items on the agenda for the meeting with the exception of scheduling the Water Forum Meetings for April, May and June 2011.

Meeting Notes

Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review, November Meeting Notes

Dale Schafer called the meeting to order at 9:14 AM and reviewed the agenda review. Questions and/or comments on November meeting notes can be emailed to Dale Schafer at daleschafer@msn.com

Current Events

Dale announced that Urban Water Management, Projects, and DAC workshops are being scheduled.

Tina Shields announced a Law of the River presentation that will be broadcasted on the web or through teleconference. The seminar is a good summary for people who want to know more about the Law of the River. January 26, 1:00-5:00 PM. Email will go out about it, and there will be an ad in the paper.

River Update

Tina Shields gave a river update, emphasizing good runoff projections for this year due to snowpack in the upper basin. Lake Mead's elevation was close to the trigger point (1075 feet) for a shortage declaration. Lake Powell is at 60% of its capacity, Lake Mead is at 40% of its capacity. USBR is required to release 7.5 MAF plus half of the Mexico obligation = 8.23 maf has to be released to meet Lower Basin/Mexico entitlements; in addition, USBR will release just over 3 MAF according in accord with operating criterion know as 'equalization' which is intended to balance the volumes of the two reservoirs (Lakes Mead and Powell). The additional 3 maf occurs if the equalization trigger is hit on April 1, and has to do with balancing storage volumes, Powell at 57% full and Mead 42% with the equalization determination being tied to an elevation differential for the two lakes. Tina said that her understanding is the releases have already been initiated in order to take advantage of power generation demands, which is a bit of a risk if the trigger point isn't hit, but forecast predictions are pretty likely. This will raise Lake Mead's elevation about 30 feet. The water level will not rise all at once; the reservoir's level will increase and some facilities will be reopened. However, nothing will be known for certain until April when the model is rerun. If there is a warm spell that melts the snowpack, the runoff projection this might change. At this point, it looks pretty good as long as there is a gradual warming spring. One year won't fix this, but will definitely improve the system.

County Planning Update

Armando Vila, Imperial County Planning Director, announced a county workshop. The County Board of Supervisors asked staff to provide direction regarding strategies for developing policies for projects dealing with renewable energy, specifically solar. Ten thousand acres are proposed for development on existing Ag land. The county will hold a workshop tomorrow to discuss this. The meeting is Wednesday, January 26, at Lion's Center in Brawley at 11:00am. Another is scheduled for the Board of Supervisors' Chambers on Thursday, January 27 at 6:00pm.

Action: Armando will send Anisa an email with details on the county's workshop and she will distribute it to the forum.

Lindsey Dale asked if documents will be presented that can be reviewed ahead of time. Armando answered that, most likely, documents will be prepared by Monday. County will post it on their website to be downloaded.

Status Report

Jennifer Wong, CDWR Southern Region, announced that Round 1 Implementation Grant applications were due January 7, and that 28 applications were received, requesting a total of \$270 million with only \$200 million available. CDWR should finish reviewing the applications at staff level by the end of this

month (Jan 2011). Then a senior review will occur before final decisions are made. CDWR is working on public comments, and final comments should be out in the next couple of weeks.

Anisa Divine noted that IID was notified that the Imperial Region has a Planning Grant, which will help complete the Imperial IRWMP so Implementation Grant funding can be sought in subsequent rounds. Jennifer added that the final decision on the Planning Grants will come out in the next couple of weeks.

Marlene Best reviewed the goals for the IRWMP. She stated that the Project Management Team (PMT) members realized that the Water Forum needed a refresher concerning its purpose and goals. The mission of the Imperial IRWMP is to develop a regional plan that includes input from agricultural, business, energy and other interests. The goal is to adopt a plan that can benefit everyone. The City of Imperial is interested in using money available to get a wastewater treatment plant that can help cities and other areas. Marlene expressed hope that the stakeholders have an idea of something important for them to propose as a possible project to include in the IRWMP. Marlene asked the group to remain focused and participating in this process. This IRWMP is necessary to enable the Imperial Region to be eligible for millions of dollars of grant money. If this plan is not adopted, the region will not be eligible for grant funds in the future.

Tina added that future water bonds will also require an adopted IRWMP. The state does not want to make decisions for local interests or prioritize projects for funding, as the state has been criticized for that practice. Therefore, the state established the regional planning process to have local agencies get together and figure out what would be the best projects for their regions. In many cases these projects have to be done for compliance reasons. Also, last year IID produced its draft water supply policy, and the IID board asked for an opportunity for the valley's water users to weigh in on those projects. Proposals from the Water Forum will be reviewed by the IID board. This process will continue even when a regional water supply decision has been made.

Agricultural Perspective

Dale mentioned that Mark McBroom wanted everyone to hear an Ag 101 lesson. Linsey Dale said that the Ag industry's biggest concern is to protect Ag's water resources. Agriculture has been here for 100 years; it's the number one industry and the farmers want it to remain number one and to protect the water that agriculture receives. Linsey stated that all can work together to find new water for energy renewable projects, but not at the expense of the future of the Ag industry. Ag is a Water Forum stakeholder to represent agriculture interests and would like to work cooperatively with other interests.

Anisa added that part of this process is also to make sure that the Water Forum integrates land use and water supply planning efforts so planned uses like solar or geothermal don't impact Ag negatively and so the energy industry knows a supply is available. This is a topic the county workshop will address.

Review of Resource Management Strategies

Matt Zidar directed the Water Forum to a table in today's handouts. Matt explained the RMS that have been addressed for use in this region: the grayed out rows are strategies that don't meet Water Forum's

goals and objectives, don't apply, or aren't feasible in this region. The objectives are is to get to project definition, to determine what programs need to be enhanced or developed, and define what policies can get us there. Matt noted that the Water Forum now has a good idea of where it is headed.

Returning to the table, Matt noted that the first column is CDWR's grouping/management objectives; second column has the specific strategies, which are important because they're the tools that CDWR calls the building blocks to create the IRWMP. This approach helps standardize the process for statewide water planning. Twenty-nine strategies come from the State Water Plan Update 2009. If all the regions review the RMS, then the state can see where the biggest problems are and figure out how to spend and apportion the taxpayer's money and make the best investments.

For our region, the problems have been identified; the next step is to discuss how to solve them by defining specific projects, and then putting them into an implementation plan for some of the \$36 million available to the Colorado River Hydrologic Region. This IRWMP should be a living document that can be updated as circumstances change.

Matt noted that scoping, which the Water Forum is involved in now, is about what you keep on the table and what you take off. The Demand Management Work Group has drafted findings, at least on water supply. GEI will package up the findings made to date, and ask for one more round of comments from the Water Forum and then call it a wrap. A few management objectives still need to be addressed, such as Stormwater/Floodwater and the areas where the Water Forum needs to establish policies, but Water Forum members can move to develop specific projects and decide how to make them work together in an integrated plan. As part of that is for the Water Forum address how to fund and build what is needed, so projects can be included in the IRWMP to guide future action. The IRWMP should help everyone make decisions. It's like a business plan.

Matt noted that when projects are submitted, the Water Forum will evaluate them to determine how they can be integrated to meet IRWMP long-term goals and objectives and to be competitive for the grant funding in the near-term. The first question for reviewing a project is, "How well does the project meet the Imperial Region goals and objectives?" The second question is whether the project is really ready to proceed in terms of CDWR criteria ("shovel ready"). The IRWMP provides a planning framework to guide future actions. It is a road map got deciding on a list of project priorities that should be maintained in order to show what is needed in the Region. The list can then be matched with funding opportunities as they arise on an ongoing basis. This document can influence the Region's ability to obtain state and federal funding. The next step is a call for projects. GEI will work with groups to define projects, evaluate readiness to proceed, define how the projects fit into the IRWMP and which should be part of the Implementation Grant. Recall that the Forum previously reached a consensus on one major issue:

- Number one opportunity for the Imperial Region is to pursue groundwater storage for IID's Colorado River underruns.
- Although no formal action was taken, the Water forum also reached general agreement that there not be transfers of water out of the Region.

Matt noted that, according to the county's General Plan, 180,000 AFY will be needed by 2050 or so for geothermal and renewable energy industry related economic growth and development.

Matt advised the Water Forum that it still needs to decide how to address the stormwater, wastewater treatment, and drinking water treatment. These will be taken up in the near future.

Carl Stills said he was unclear on "calling for projects" and asked if they are categorized as projects that help create new water or, also projects that can demand the water. Matt answered that they are publically sponsored projects that address IRWMP goals and objectives, and fit findings that have been made. That is, projects that fit into one of the IRWMP goals; apply resource management strategies; and provide tangible, regional benefits would get higher priority. Projects can be recycling, regional wastewater treatment, water conservation, or use other strategies. For example, a project could be to install meters to measure large landscape water use and support managing and reducing demand. The key is to integrate the RMS, meet multiple objectives and provide regional benefits rather than projects that benefit just one constituency or group.

Matt explained that the CDWR Reduce Water Demand objective includes an agricultural water use efficiency RMS and an urban water use efficiency RMS. He noted that for the Imperial IRWMP, energy water use efficiency was added as a strategy since it is the largest potential future new water demand.

Matt said that the Projects Work Group will not meeting in February; instead be a Project Identification Workshop will be held where stakeholders can learn what needs to be done to submit a project to be considered for inclusion in the IRWMP. A project must first be in the IRWMP; the next step is to decide which are ready to include in an Implementation Grant. The first step is to screen: will it meet the goals and objects adopted in the IRWMP? Also does it meet local needs and how well does it meet CDWR requirements?

Matt remarked that a lot of projects that are really great ideas may not be ready to qualify for funding. These projects would be kept in the IRWMP if they would support the regional goals, but would not be prioritized or selected to go into the Implementation Grant, because they are not ready (e.g., no design, incomplete environmental review, local funding not identified). It is necessary to prioritize the projects first in the IRWMP, before submitting a grant application and list of projects and asking CDWR to review.

Luis Olmedo mentioned that USEPA was going to talk about available grants and that the update on the New River had a lot of interest. A passed bill was passed to improve the water quality of the New River. The Deputy Director of the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Jose Angel, said he'd try to give a brief overview next meeting.

Action: Schedule and confirm time on the February Water Forum agenda for Jose Angel to discuss the New River Improvement Project.

Energy and Industrial Water Demands

Matt said a December 15, 2010 report has been adopted by California Energy Commission regarding best management practices for power plant cooling water use in desert environments. This will help the

Imperial Region in deciding where and how energy can conserve water, and how the local approach to energy water conservation can be consistent with the state's approach. This will help during project review and approval and ensure reasonable beneficial use of imported water supplies. The Water Forum will be making decisions and recommending where to invest on water supplies and conservation savings. Energy also needs to decide where to invest – whether in new water supplies or in water conservation technology. As a region, we are trying to figure out BMPs and how to maybe reduce the projected 180,000 AFY demand from the renewable energy industry. Unless water projects are developed that create new supplies, the demand will be met from the fixed supply of Colorado River water that is already fully utilized.

The state and federal government are promoting consistent standards for energy water supply and conservation BMPs, and they want consistent local policy, so everyone knows what to expect and the information is not confusing to the people trying to build these projects. The county and IID could establish local BMPs, so both agencies' policies are standardized. This would expedite energy project review and approval. The state is pushing cooling water conserving technologies and alternatives to the use of imported fresh water, especially if using water for cooling would have environmental or third party effects (e.g., reduce water available for agriculture).

Marlene Best has talked to the city managers about what they are doing for urban water conservation and future use.

Algae Farms

Chris Schoneman asked, as part of energy demand, how much the algae industry takes part in the discussion of the energy portion of our valley. Tina said a consultant at yesterday's Projects WG asked the same question. Two algae farms currently operate in the valley, and that does affect the demand. More algae farms are considering operation in the valley; but at this point, the maximum amount of water has been designated for industry. Tina noted that IID hasn't been approached by any new algae developers recently.

Andy Horne asked if the water supply for algae farms comes from the Ag water allotment. He was sure a catfish farm water supply does. Tina answered that, if algae growers are willing to live under the Ag rules, where they would get cut back during times of shortage, then they're Ag and would pay ag rates; however, if they want a long-term contract, and don't want to be cut back when there is a shortage, then they're industrial and pay at this rate. She noted that, as that industry grows, IID might need to rethink those standards.

Ag Water Use Efficiency RMS

Linsey Dale noted that in an Ag water use efficiency document from the previous day's work group meeting, voluntary fallowing range-of-cost is listed at \$85-400. Matt said that was based on numbers for the current fallowing program and related to the cost of implementing projects to conserve water as identified in the Systems Conservation Plan. The exact number is not currently known and GEI plans to do additional cost analysis and economic evaluation. He added that the cost to mitigate impacts could

increase these numbers. Linsey remarked that third party impacts aren't considered in the number, and she asked what happens to that farmland when it is put back into production. The entire community is affected. Matt stated that the minutes will be revised with this in mind. He noted that there was good discussion at yesterday's meetings, adding that language needs to be standardized and that there needs to be continuing discussion on those numbers.

Practice Resources Stewardship

The Practice Resources Stewardship management objective includes planning of land management, crop idling, permanent land retirement, economic incentives, and other tools that could help address this objective. When the county makes a decision on land use (as such as changing Ag to solar) that will change water use. Approval of a change of place, type or volume of water use is an IID decision. The group talked about what makes up permanent fallowing, i.e. land retirement; the impacts of land use changes on a fixed supply; developing an integrated water and land use policy; and "buckets" of water for defined uses; and annual apportionment. The next step is to determine how these issues together. IID and the county have authorities on these factors.

Action: Complete the analysis of the RMS for the Practice Resources Stewardship management objective to address land use conversion, and bring findings and recommendations for Water Forum discussion (Matt). PMT is to review and decide on establishing a work group.

Linsey added that agricultural stakeholders are happy to see planning represented at the Water Forum. She noted the importance in having the county's input on these issues and that communication between IID and county is important. The Water Forum will need to address how the region will be impacted by these land use decisions.

Carl Stills mentioned that talking about land use conversion might require more time.

Ag Water Use Efficiency RMS, continued

Regarding Linsey's comment regarding the range of cost for voluntary fallowing, Anisa explained that the number reflects what is being paid to growers. It was an oversight and will be corrected.

Anisa noted that if, through the IRWMP, the valley actually goes in the direction of additional on-farm measures and intra-valley change of use from ag to MCI, a high percentage of farmland would have to be enrolled in the on-farm programs – in the range of 430,000 acres out of the currently farmable 475,000 acres. These numbers are way at the edge of what is possible. Ralph Strahm noted that the on-farm conservation projects for the San Diego transfer have not been started, that participation by valley farmers will be voluntary. He concluded that there are a lot of unknowns.

Matt stated that he will work with the Ag industry and others to ask what can be conserved (through land use changes, by energy industry) so water supply can be used by someone else in the valley; and, if you're using water, what do you have to do to demonstrate that you are reasonably and beneficially using the water. The Water Forum still needs to address energy industry water use and what is

reasonable water use and cooling water best management practices. Documenting reasonable beneficial use by all types of use is how you protect your water rights.

Matt stated that, regarding agricultural water conservation and whether additional actions could free up water for apportionment to other uses, there's really a limited amount of certainty. He noted that the System Conservation Plan and Definite Plan have to be implemented for the Imperial Region before we're 100% sure if there are other opportunities. In five to ten years possibly, the Region will know how well these programs work. Bottom line: additional agricultural water conservation savings would result in very little new supply, and further actions are not considered a near-term set of actions.

Projects Work Group Report

Tom Sephton reviewed the Projects WG progress. He noted that the questions at hand were:

- Can a **mitigation bank** for environmental impacts be developed with grant funds? The answer was yes.
- Is **desalination** near-term? It's essentially long-term, because the cost is higher than users in the valley are used to paying or would be willing to pay, although it's close to what Hudson Ranch has already agreed to pay.
- **Algae farms** haven't been evaluated in the demand estimates, and perhaps they should be. In many cases they can use non-potable water, such as sea water or agricultural drain water.

The Projects WG reviewed findings for Desalinization RMS and for Recycled Municipal Wastewater RMS. **Recycled wastewater** appears to be something that should be done in the near-term: it has multiple benefits for cities and provides new water supply in the short-term. But there is a limited amount of municipal wastewater available.

The possibility of **wheeling** recycled or desalinated water in IID canals was discussed. This is not viable since it could influence marketability of agricultural products and because of pipe connections to IID canals. This increases the costs for recycled water projects since development of conveyance facilities (purple pipe) is required to move the recycled water to a place of use.

It was explained that the cost for purple pipes could be reduced through an **exchange policy**. Under such a policy, physical transportation over a long distance would not be needed as the water could be provided to a current Colorado River water user as a **substitute supply**; thus, allowing Colorado River water to be used by another user. Use of recycled water **in-lieu** of Colorado River supplies would result in an overall net increase in the supply by creating a **secondary use**.

The Water Forum previously reviewed findings for **large interregional conveyance**, such as Sea to Sea. Large interregional conveyance is potentially a long-term proposition, and the concept could work. The point was made that conveyance could move water both directions and that the Water Forum had said "no out of area transfers." There was a quick review of **system reoperation** and management, which is being handled by IID via the System Conservation Plan.

The Projects WG reviewed the **project submittal process**. First round projects will be coming in quickly. The Projects WG took a quick look at what a form that stakeholders could use to submit projects to be considered by the Water forum will look like. Next meeting we will go into what kind of projects will be needed.

Chris asked if Sea to Sea will be excluded from consideration. Tom explained that, essentially, the Projects WG was saying that any **large interregional conveyance** would only be considered as a long-term prospect, and that it's outside our scope; however, the Region could import Pacific water without actually touching the Salton Sea and that impact is not a reason to exclude the project from consideration, although the cost *is* a reason to exclude it.

Matt added that it wasn't necessarily the impacts, it was that a lot of Sea to Sea project concepts have been tied to Salton Sea restoration concepts, which *was* one of the reasons to exclude it from near-term priority. The Projects WG did not rule out opportunities for these project concepts, but clarified the issues (complexity, political acceptability, scope of the IRWMP, cost, timing, etc.).

Charlene said she thought a draft of the **wheeling policy** was reviewed by IID. Tina explained that a draft was proposed in the first IID January 2011 board meeting. The plan should come back at a February 2011 meeting for additional action or review. It should be on the website for review.

Charlene also asked if the City of Brawley is on the Projects WG. Matt replied that they weren't at the meeting. Yazmin Arellano added that the Projects WG meeting typically conflicts with another meeting she needs to attend; however, she does view the emails provided to her and keep in contact with Matt.

Carl reverted back to the Sea-to-Sea issue. He asked why it isn't considered an increased supply. It's not just a Salton Sea issue. So maybe it should be included. Tina answered that, while Sea to Sea was excluded, it will be in the projects list, but there wasn't a need to label that project specifically. Matt added that all known projects we acknowledged. When all the projects have been submitted, the Projects WG review what's tangible, doable, and available now (immediate, near-term) and in the future (mid-, long-term).

Alex Jack noted that if a pipeline is built from the ocean to the valley, then our water can potentially be taken away through that same pipeline, and that concerns him.

Disadvantaged Communities Needs Assessment

Matt said that one task is outreach to DACs. Outreach contacts were made to ask where the agency was in their planning process and what their needs were in related to water supply, water quality and stormwater. GEI built a contact list with the help of county. GEI made calls, and asked our questions, documented the interviews and produced the Technical Memorandum. GEI intends to talk one more time with the DAC at the proposed workshop to confirm what their needs are. There will also be a Projects Workshop to help project sponsors prepare to submit projects for Water Forum to consider their inclusion projects in the IRWMP and potentially in a grant application. Projects from a single city could qualify for grant money if the city is a DAC and the project would provide regional benefits.

In Proposition 50, if a project wasn't regional, then city needs weren't part of the IRWMP and typically could not get money (if the project was just for that city or was needed to comply with regulatory requirements), but under proposition 84, a single-city or single-agency project that would serve only a single set of rate payers may be competitive.

GEI has identified DAC needs, but not the projects that might meet the identified need. That is the next step. Getting DAC projects into the IRWMP will help qualify them for other grants, as well. Matt asked Water Forum stakeholders to review and make comments of *the Draft Technical Memorandum on DAC Needs*, which was included in today's handouts. The proposed DAC workshop agenda was also part of the agenda package. This workshop will better prepare the DACs for the 'call for projects.' February 15 is the proposed date. Input was requested from Luis Olmedo and Eric Reyes as to how to conduct outreach and get more public involvement.

Edith Harmon asked if DACs included small communities scattered throughout the county. Matt answered yes, and stated that it's all documented in the Technical Memorandum. Anisa asked if it relates to Ocotillo. Matt answered that it includes those in the boundaries of the IRWMP, which includes Ocotillo. Luis stated that February 15 is fine. Matt noted that it's still only a proposed date. Eric Reyes added that they would help brainstorm ideas for the workshop. Matt invited additional comments on the workshop, suggested speakers, and potential invitees. The invitation will go in early February.

Preliminary Call for Projects

Matt said that the forms to help project applicants respond to the Preliminary Call for Projects are being drafted along with the Project Workshop agenda and supporting materials. The results of the call for projects will be a preliminary list of projects that meet the IRWMP goals and objectives, and that will implement the CDWR RMS that are appropriate for the Imperial Region. The first step is to get the projects all on the table and then to discuss which are doable, how they can be integrated, etc. The proposed call for projects period is February 15 - March 15. The preliminary call is to identify what projects are out there and should be included in the IRWMP. A project can just be a concept. Everyone is invited to submit projects if they meet the IRWMP goals. Forms will be provided to input a project. Projects will be ranked by completeness (budget, environmental documents, schedule, etc), and when they could be implemented. The next step after review is to decide how to include them in the IRWMP.

A second call will be more specific, based on what needs to be done to meet CDWR criteria for grant funding. Basically, the projects would need to be 'shovel ready' to be competitive. This means that the funding plan, environmental review, and specifications are complete and the project is ready to be constructed. Projects need to meet IRWMP goals and objectives and provide measureable regional benefits to be included in the IRWMP.

Anisa said that an email with the guidelines for the preliminary call for projects will be sent out to the Water Forum. Matt said that the guidelines will include information sent out on how to fill out the form and how project are to be evaluated. In response to a question, Matt answered that the form is based on what CDWR wants in the grant, but the first screening is to identify how the project would help the Region meet its goals. He added that it's not all about grant funding, it's about doing good planning by

defining what is good for the long term as well as what can get funded. The first screening is what helps the Region; the second screening is what qualifies for funding. The criteria to qualify for funding are more rigorous and have very explicit standards. Stakeholders have to be prepared to do the work needed to qualify the project for grant funding (completed environmental documents, solid funding for local match, economic evaluation, etc.)

Action: Anisa will email Guidelines for the Preliminary Call for Projects to the Water Forum.

Carl asked about a preliminary format for the application. Matt said that there is one and suggested the Water Forum go through the application together to better understand it. The Form needs to capture information that will help us to evaluate projects using the IRWMP goals and DWR criteria.

<<The group looked at the rough draft form>>

A Preliminary Call for Projects Workshop will be being for February 12:00-3:30 PM. Matt said that the call for projects is a two-step process and that it is really important to take this first step to evaluate which projects could be ready and qualify for funding – either on their own or when integrated with other projects. GEI will help project sponsors determine what is needed to prepare complete project information and is needed to support the grant application and qualify for funding. The grant asks for a lot of information from applicants and this will be challenging for project sponsors. The first round will help us define what is needed to get the IRWMP, adopted and competitive grant application together by January 2012.

Action: Following discussion, it was decided that Matt would provide the application document PDF; and that an announcement about the workshop would be sent out soon.

Marlene suggested that we send out an email linking everyone to the website. The IRWMP website isn't listed on any of our paperwork.

Matt said he'd like everyone to have a hard copy and access to the PDF form. We'll send email alerts to stakeholders and interested parties, and try to make the process as easy as possible for project sponsors.

Anisa said reported that Marion Champion has added add a button for "Adopted Documents" on the IRWMP website.

Matt said that July 2011 is the next round for Implementation Grant applications, and that the third round was proposed for January 2012.

Jennifer from CDWR said that the third round is anticipated, but she doesn't have a concrete date yet. The second round is also likely to be postponed. The Proposal Solicitation Package from CDWR may change, but the guidelines and requirements for evaluating projects will remain the same. It's not necessarily going to be in January and she will try to get a date.

Matt said sample project evaluation criteria were circulated to the Water Forum and Projects Work Group for review (*Draft IID Plan* criteria, and an example from Upper Kings Basin IRWMP). The *Draft IID Plan* criteria were used by the IID board to evaluate rank capital projects to increase the water supply. IID will make sure to get the sample form put on the website and will send the website link. Tina said that we will add the website to the header of the documents.

Action: Place project ranking criteria sample form on the website and send the website link to Water Forum stakeholders and interested parties.

Action: Website address to be added to IRWMP headers.

Luis said he uses the website and feels it is a useful tool. Matt said we'd also send around CDWR's website so you can see what they want. Andy Horne said lets link that to our website, too.

Action: CDWR link to be added to the IRWMP website and email to Water Forum.

Action: Calendar to be added to the IRWMP website.

Action: Stakeholder links and/or information to be added to the IRWMP website.

Next Steps

Dale stated the dates of upcoming meetings: February 17, March 24. The Water Forum agreed that future meetings would be April 21, May 19 and June 16. Water Forum attendees were reminded to park to the west of the SDG &E building.

Mark asked if work group meetings will still be the day before the Water Forum meeting. Matt said they're not set in stone, noting that some work groups may not continue to meet. He explained that, if specific issues need to be addressed, a work group would be set up consisting of members affected by that issue. On the other hand, specific workshops rather than standing work group meetings may be held with stakeholders meeting more as specific interest groups, rather than as work groups. Either way, the value of different perspectives is retained, and the issues will still be brought to the Water Forum for review and final action. What is important is to make the best use of people's time to be most effective, and to be more focused.

Any stakeholder can email Matt with suggestions for the Water Forum agenda, or if there's a topic that would be good to present to the Water Forum.

Tom said a workshop on how to do regional mitigation banking might be useful. Matt replied that that topic would be considered in the future.

Anisa noted the demand forecast technical memo is to be approved at that February meeting.

Andy Horn said a brief presentation from the New River technical advisory committee would be timely to be on the next agenda. Andy will contact Tina concerning that presentation.

Meeting adjourned at 11:01am.