A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL
Members present at roll call were Chair Rebecca Falk, Vice Chair Clint Brandin (left at 6:25), Secretary Bill Haneline, David Farley, Linda Haddock came in at 4:35, Judy Haldeman, Bonnie Petrach. Meeting called to order at 4:30

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE MEETINGS OF April 4, 2019
Member Farley made motion to accept, Haldeman seconded. For discussion Chair Falk had some corrections. One was to add Leanne Crow to the County participants. There was a duplication under F 1. Announcements and Correspondence that needs removing that concerned an upcoming meeting with Supervisor Desmond. F 4. words need to be added to the CSG Chair’s meeting with Supervisor Desmond and their discussion about the GSP. Farley moved to approve the April minutes as amended. The vote was all in favor.

C. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION:
An audience member who lives in de Anza brought up that a neighbor has been painting and selling cars and changing the norms of their community. He asked about the codes and that he had talked to County Code Compliance about the problem. When can he expect them to respond? Chair Falk told him that next was Action Items and code compliance was the subject.

D. Action Items:
1. Report back from the CSG Code Compliance List Subcommittee. David Farley distributed an e-mail that he and Bonnie Petrach had put together for the CSG board. In it the letter said that the BS CSG should not be the first place for a complaint to go, that Code Enforcement is the first contact for the complainant. Also the severity of the code violation should be assigned a color and a timeline. If the timeline is not met, then the BS CSG should get involved and contact the County. Also, we are a land use advisory group and not be tasked with contacting the county for construction/remodeling without permits. The BS CSG should ask Code Enforcement for a more timely and aggressive action on violations. Falk would also like to have facts to back up a paragraph in it that says that there has been reported violations that are still around without resolution and they are lingering on for years.

2. Report back from Haldeman and Haddock on a possible CSG letter to present to Supervisor Desmond at the upcoming May 7 Revitalization Meeting at the library. Haldeman said they kept the letter down to one paragraph about the lack of new private development in Borrego Springs and the reason for this is it is cost prohibitive due to the FEMA based requirements of the Planning and Development Services. And if Desmond is aware of the FEMA report, if his staff has reviewed it, and to work with Borrego Springs and the Planning and Development Services to search for solutions? Falk read her suggestions and one item to add is that the BS CSG asks for Supervisor Desmond to support the involvement of SD County in the implementation phase of the Borrego Valley Basin GSP, remaining part of the GSA for Borrego. There is some concern that County might not support the GSP and this might help keep our Supervisor stay in with us.
Motion to approve the letter as amended made by Haddock, seconded by Brandin. Vote was a unanimous Yes.

3. GSP Comment letter from Sponsor Group prior to the May 21 deadline for public comment. Rebecca Falk will present a draft letter for consideration and possible action if approved, with or without modification. Haldeman made a motion to approve letter, seconded by Farley. Discussion followed on each 7 items.
1. The Borrego Springs Community Sponsor Group (BSCSG) would prefer no reductions in water use for the municipal sector. Proportional reductions are a major concession to non-municipal sectors. BWD’s Baseline Pumping Allocation (BPA) should remain at 2461 af/yr as proposed to the Advisory Committee or at the full 2700 or so af/yr that was the highest single year water use for the municipal sector in 2010, and not be reduced further in addition to the concession of proportional reductions. Proportional reductions are only acceptable as long as the amount of water used under Human Right to Water provisions of state law is not subject to reductions for municipal users under the GSP. If other sectors do not agree to sign the GSP, BWD should fully assert its interest and seek current water use and water for the future with no reductions.

Vote:
5 – Yes (Brandin, Falk, Haldeman, Haneline, Petrach)
1 – No (Haddock)
1 – Abstention (Farley)
PASSED

2. Water reductions should be front-loaded (using a fixed percentage of the Baseline Pumping Allocations to calculate yearly reductions rather than a fixed volume of water as is currently indicated in the GSP) so that higher reductions in water use occur early. This will save significantly more of the water in our aquifer than the current reduction method will, and safeguards against water quality and water management issues that will be too late to adequately address if they occur later in the reduction period after the aquifer has been dewatered more significantly. Changing methods for calculating mandatory water reductions saves as much aquifer water as shortening the reduction period to from 20 years to 15 years using the current method.

Vote:
4 – Yes (Falk, Haneline, Haldeman, Petrach)
1 – No (Haddock)
2 – Abstention (Farley, Brandin)
PASSED

3. The Sponsor Group supports the mandatory metering program as detailed in Appendix E of the draft GSP and its immediate implementation upon GSP approval, and would like the GSP to describe that program, not as an “approach” in the section on the mandatory metering program, GSP p. 3-36, second full paragraph, but rather as a requirement that is detailed in Appendix E, so that the mandatory requirements are emphasized in all parts of the GSP. Similarly, p. ES-5, PMA #3, last sentence, should affirmatively read that Mandatory water metering...“will” take place rather than “is proposed to take place following adoption of this GSP.”

Vote:
6 – Yes (Brandin, Falk, Farley, Haldeman, Haneline, Petrach)
1 – Abstention (Haddock)
PASSED

4. Water quality is an essential concern. Better data must fill the data gaps for water quality in the
North Management Area. New monitoring wells for water quality that are not quite yet in place, and additional wells now in the process of being secured for water quality monitoring, won’t yield usable initial data once installed for about three years (and then it will show the beginning of a likely trend). The Sponsor Group would like the GSP to explicitly specify that the governing body that implements the GSP has the authority to impose mandatory water quality monitoring of any major wells in the subbasin, including any agricultural wells, so that any needed comprehensive data is made available. The GSP should also address who will pay for addressing water quality issues that arise in agricultural areas, including under a water trading program.

Vote:
5 – Yes (Falk, Farley, Haldeman, Haneline, Petrach)
1 – No (Haddock)
1 – Abstention (Brandin)
PASSED

5. The GSP should list Ratepayers and the Sponsor Group as stakeholders in the discussions and crafting of a Water Trading Program because what happens to pumped water in Borrego Springs is a matter of public concern about a public resource, and also because of land use impacts of such a program.

Vote:
6 – Yes (Brandin, Falk, Farley, Haldeman, Haneline, Petrach)
1 – No (Haddock)
PASSED

6. There should be consideration in the GSP for our SDAC (Severely Disadvantaged Community) status: cost impacts that can affect water rates must be considered.

Vote:
6 – Yes (Brandin, Falk, Farley, Haldeman, Haneline, Petrach)
1 – Abstention (Haddock)
PASSED

7. The Sponsor Group supports zoning changes and redistribution that lowers zoning density in some areas and raises it in others, with the idea that while we do not have enough water to support adding additional dwelling units with new subdivisions, there is room for growth by changing the density of existing zoning and in effect, redistributing already planned for dwelling units. This should be one of the considerations in the section on Land Use in the GSP.

Vote:
3 – Yes (Falk, Haneline)
4 – No (Brandin, Farley, Haddock, Haldeman, Petrach)
FAILED

Motion made to accept the amended version made by Haldeman and seconded by Petrach
6 – Yes (Brandin, Falk, Farley, Haldeman, Haneline, Petrach)
1 – No (Haddock)
Passed

F. GROUP BUSINESS:
1. Announcements & Correspondence Received.
   General Plan Cleanup- was discussed by Chair Falk and she reports that the old abandoned hotel at the end of Tilting T on Borrego Valley Rd. is going back to a C40 designation and maybe finally can be cleaned up.

DPW Road Resurfacing Update – Falk received a yearly letter from DPW. The Secretary will check if the committee is still standing. Falk and Petrach read several roads on the letter that will need attention.

Library Crosswalk/traffic engineering- people want a safe crossing from the Mall to the library. Chair Falk has checked with Frank Arabello and is waiting for a reply. She will put this on the next agenda as an item.

2. Discussion Items
   Talk about the July meeting and does it need to move the date or cancel? Chair Falk will come up put it in next month’s agenda as an action item.

3. Subcommittee Reports
   Ad Hoc Committee on PLDO (Park) Funds.
   Haldeman reports that there’s nothing yet. She needs to get hold of Marcus.

4. Meeting Updates:
   There was a meeting for Chairs at Desmond’s office and Chair Falk came away with positive feelings. Groundwater Sustainability Plan: Chair Falk presented items to be included in a BS CSG comment letter to be used during the review process for the GSP.

5. Borrego Community Plan Review.
   Postponed until the June meeting. Read pages 85-96

G. ADJOURNMENT
   Motion to adjourn made by Farley and seconded by Petrach- all members voted aye.
   Meeting over at 6:45

The next regular meeting will be held June 6, 2019, 4:30 pm, Borrego Springs Library Community Room, 2850 Country Club Rd, Borrego Springs, California

Respectfully Submitted,

Bill Haneline
Secretary