

AGENDA
Borrego SGMA Advisory Committee
Meeting #3

Monday, May 15, 2017
10:00 AM – 3:00 PM

Location: Borrego Water District
806 Palm Canyon Drive, Borrego Springs, CA 92004

Conference Line: Listen to the Committee Meeting by calling: 218-339-7816. Access Code: 591-7105

NOTE: Public comment periods will be accommodated at the end of each agenda item (excluding items 1 and 9). The duration of each comment period will be at the discretion of the meeting Facilitator.

Meeting Objectives:

- Discuss and possibly approve the Draft A/C By-Laws
- Discuss AC's procedures for engaging their Constituent Groups
- Receive updates from AC members
- Receive information regarding content, timing, and deliverables related to Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) development from Prime Consultant – Dudek inc (Trey Driscoll)

#	TIME	ITEM	PRESENTER
1	10:00 am	Welcome, Introductions and Opening Remarks Review Agenda and Meeting Objectives Approval of April 10, 2017 A/C Meeting Minutes	Beth Hart – Borrego WD (BWD) Meagan Wylie – Facilitator: Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP)
2	10:15 am	Review, Discussion and Possible Adoption of A/C By-Laws	Meagan
3	10:45 am	Review and Discussion of Draft AC Agenda Development Schedule and Interaction with Constituent Group (CG)	Beth All
4	11:15 am	Borrego Valley Stewardship Council (BVSC): Overview of Organizational Mission and Discussion of GSP Letter to the County of SD	Suzanne Lawrence, BVSC
5	11:30 am	Receive Updates from AC Members on CG Engagement New Farm in Borrego	All Rebecca Falk, BSCSG
	12:00 pm	<i>Lunch</i>	
6	12:30 pm	Presentation on the Borrego Basin Groundwater Sustainability Plan: Content, Schedule and Deliverables	Trey Driscoll, Dudek Inc.
7	2:30 pm	General Comment from A/C Members and Public	All
8	2:50 pm	Next Steps, AC Meeting Date(s) and Closing Remarks	Meagan/All
	3:00 pm	<i>Adjourn</i>	

Please be advised that times associated with agenda are approximations only.

Borrego SGMA Website: <http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/SGMA/borrego-valley.html>

AGENDA ITEM #1 – April 10, 2017 Draft Minutes

DRAFT MINUTES

Borrego SGMA Advisory Committee

Meeting #2

Monday, April 10, 2017

10:00 AM – 3:00 PM

Location: Borrego High School (Meeting Room next to Gymnasium)
2281 Diegueno Rd., Borrego Springs, CA 92004

Attendance: **Committee members:** Present: Jim Seley, Richard Dopp, Jim Wilson,
Suzanne Lawrence, Rebecca Falk,
Jack McGrory, Bill Berkley
Absent: Ryan Hall, Kathy Dice
Core Team members: Beth Hart, BWD Lyle Brecht, BWD
Geoff Poole, BWD Leanne Crow, County of San Diego
Jim Bennett, County of San Diego
Staff: Meagan Wylie, Center Wendy Quinn, BWD
for Collaborative Policy
Public: Ray Schindler
Michael Sadler, *Borrego Sun* Tom Beltran
James Sward Diane Johnson
Anne Bogardt Sara Lockett, OWSVRA
Jan Krasowski Dennis Jensen

Item #1: Welcome, Introductions and Opening Remarks

A. Review Agenda and Meeting Objectives: Meagan Wylie welcomed the attendees and announced that a quorum was present. The Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) Advisory Committee (A/C) members, Core Team members and staff introduced themselves. Ms. Wylie reviewed the meeting ground rules and agenda and invited those wishing to be included on the A/C distribution list to sign up on the County of San Diego (County) website.

B. Approval of March 6, 2017 A/C Meeting Minutes: Upon motion by Member Seley, seconded by Member McGrory and carried, the Minutes of the March 6, 2017 A/C Meeting were approved.

Item #2: Support for A/C Members

A. Borrego Water District (BWD) Staff Support with Nominating Organizations: Geoff Poole pointed out that issues will be presented to the A/C, then each member will meet with his/her nominating organization for discussion, followed by a report back to the A/C. He volunteered to attend and facilitate nominating committee meetings upon request.

BWD Board President Beth Hart invited the A/C's attention to a handout entitled "Organizational Questions to be Considered by Advisory Committee Members," outlining things for members to think about when working with their nominating organizations. Organizational rules may not be necessary, especially in small groups, but for some the guidelines may be helpful. Member McGrory, representing the Borrego Water Coalition (BWC) and independent pumpers, inquired about how to contact his constituents. Mr. Poole volunteered to provide an Email list. Member Lawrence asked whether her nominating organization was responsible for solving problems or just informing the A/C of them. President Hart recommended that if the nominating organization fails to reach a consensus, the discussion should nevertheless be reported to the A/C. Member Wilson requested that a

further discussion of this issue be placed on a future agenda. Member Lawrence announced that she wanted to present an update from her nominating organization, and Ms. Wylie suggested making such reports a standing item on each agenda.

B. Optional Email Addresses for A/C Members: Mr. Poole explained that a recent court ruling provides that personal Emails and cell phone messages relating to the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) are subject to the Public Records Act. BWD has provided BWD Email addresses to its Board members so they can keep their business communications separate. He agreed to do the same for the A/C upon request. Member Dodd requested an A/C Email address, and Mr. Poole agreed to work with him. Member Lawrence asked how A/C or nominating organization requests for research should be handled, and Mr. Poole asked that they be initially submitted to him.

Item #3: Review, Discussion and Possible Adoption of A/C By-Laws

Ms. Wylie invited the A/C's attention to the draft GSP A/C By-Laws in the agenda package and on the screen. Member Dodd questioned the use of the term "Party's" in Article 1, Section D ("... each Party's responsibilities for Plan implementation" The A/C agreed to amend the sentence to read in part, ". . . each GSA Party's responsibilities" Member Lawrence expressed concern that the section addressed enforcement, but not compliance. Leanne Crow explained that the phrase, "The GSP shall include, but not be limited to, . . ." preceding the reference to enforcement implies that compliance may be included in the GSP. Member Wilson requested a definition of "PDS" in Article 2, Section B. The By-Laws will be amended to read, "Planning and Development Services (PDS)." Member Dodd inquired as to the necessity of Section 2, Articles A and B, regarding the qualifications for A/C members. Ms. Wylie explained that it was for reference in case of a vacancy on the A/C. Member Wilson asked why the GSP's effects on the community were not addressed, and Ms. Crow replied that this was addressed in the consultant's scope of work. Article 2, Section D(4) provided that, "A vacancy shall be recognized for any AC Member who . . . regularly fails to abide by the discussion covenants of the AC . . ." After discussion, it was agreed to add a provision that a member's retention would be discussion by the A/C followed by a recommendation to the Core Team. The A/C agreed that Article 4, Section A would be amended to provide that meetings would be chaired by the facilitator, and if she cannot serve, the A/C will decide on another chair. After discussion, the A/C agreed that in Article 5, Section C, paragraphs (5) ("I do not agree with the decision and feel the need to **block** the decision being accepted as consensus") and (6) ("I feel that we have no clear sense of unity in the group. We need to **do more work** before consensus can be achieved") should be in reverse order, and in old paragraph (6)/new paragraph (5), the first sentence should be deleted.

A member of the audience suggested that at the beginning of each meeting, staff could review the attachments in the agenda package. His was not complete. Mr. Poole agreed to distribute the entire package 72 hours in advance of the meetings. Member Wilson suggested a reference to the County website on the agenda. President Hart suggested including these items in the By-Laws, and Ms. Wylie volunteered to prepare an outline of meeting protocol.

The Committee broke for lunch at 11:30 a.m. and reconvened at 12:15 p.m.

Item #4:

GSP Update, Overview and Informational Presentation

A. Group discussion of Goals for GSP: Jim Bennett, County Groundwater Geologist, stated that SGMA provides a means to bring basins throughout the State into sustainability. He explained that the prime GSP consultant is Dudek, Inc., working with subconsultants GeoSyntec, Environmental Navigation, Wiedlin & Associates, Raftelis Financial, Hidden Valley Pump, O'Day and Babcock. The total contract is \$1.2 million. A Dudek representative will attend the May A/C meeting. Member Wilson asked whether technical questions from the A/C should go to the County, and Mr. Poole asked that they

be directed to him initially. Director Brecht reported that BWD had contributed \$3 million to the GSP effort (\$1 million from ratepayers and \$2 from State and federal sources). Mr. Bennett explained that the GSP preparation is estimated to be a two-year process. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) is not applicable to GSP preparation and adoption, but is applicable to any project that would implement actions pursuant to the GSP. Member Falk asked for examples of projects which might require an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Mr. Bennett cited water conservation and efficiency projects, changes to the County General Plan or zoning, or agricultural fallowing. He went on to report that part of the GSP will be to evaluate the General Plan and zoning. Borrego Springs has a community plan which sets forth a vision for the community, and the A/C will play a key role in how the community will look in 2040 when sustainability is achieved.

Mr. Bennett presented a map of the Borrego Valley Basin, explaining that last year it was divided by the California Department of Water Resources into two areas, the Borrego Springs Subbasin and the Ocotillo Wells Subbasin. The overdraft is in the Borrego Springs Subbasin, and that will be the focus of the GSP. Member Berkley inquired about the location of the boundary between the two subbasins, and was told it was at the San Felipe Wash, or Texas Dip. Mr. Bennett next discussed an outline of the GSP, including existing data compilation, existing data assessment; evaluation/development of a monitoring program; development of a data management system; water level and water quality collection; a water budget; development of projects, management actions and best management practices; support projects and management actions; and the preparing the GSP itself. He pointed out that development of projects, management actions and best management practices would be a big part of today's brainstorming session. All items in the GSP outline are part of Dudek's consulting contract.

Member Lawrence expressed concern regarding potential budget shortfalls. Ms. Crow assured her that projects would be discussed by the A/C and Core Team before being presented to the consultant. A member of the audience asked who would have access to the data management system, and Ms. Crow replied that once completed it would be on the County SGMA website. Diane Johnson asked whether other County agencies were participating in the GSP, and Mr. Bennett replied that they were (Environmental Health; Public Works; Agriculture, Weights and Measures; Parks and Recreation; General Services; and Air Pollution Control District).

Mr. Bennett went on to present graphs depicting baseline groundwater production (as of January 1, 2015) and estimated sustainable yield. Member Seley expressed concern because he had begun reducing water use in his agricultural business before 2015 and did not want to be penalized. Mr. Bennett was aware of the issue, shared the concern and said this was something that would have to be considered when developing the baseline groundwater production. Mr. Bennett further explained that there are three areas necessary in estimating sustainable yield/water budget: storage, recharge and demand. Director Brecht pointed out that potential water quality issues will impact water rates, and Mr. Bennett agreed that water quality would be taken into consideration as part of the GSP. The discussion then turned to projects and management actions; which ones would be viable and mutually beneficial for all sectors (municipal, recreation and agriculture). Examples presented included water conservation/efficiency, land use/planning, and water credits/entitlements. Mr. Bennett suggested questions to be asked in reviewing each example. Member Falk pointed out that Borrego Springs has a community plan but no enforcement. Mr. Bennett noted that there are two issues here, who has enforcement authority and how should it be enforced.

Member Lawrence pointed out the importance of how the Borrego community is defined. For example, tourism should be included.

Member McGrory asked how agricultural water use was quantified. Mr. Bennett explained that it was based on the amount of land and type of crop. President Hart asked when there would be authority under SGMA to meter and monitor wells, and Ms. Crow replied that the authority exists now. This is a good issue for the A/C. An audience member asked about restrictions on monitoring, and Mr. Bennett noted there is flexibility, depending on the GSA, which needs to work with the A/C. Another question dealt with where the flush from the park goes, and Mr. Poole explained that it depends on the location of the flushing. It either goes to the sewer or a septic tank.

Member Berkley pointed out there are systems to reuse gray water for irrigation. President Hart suggested incentives for golf courses to upgrade their irrigation systems. Member Lawrence reported that De Anza Golf Course had applied for a grant to reduce water use but it was denied. She suggested looking into how this could be approached differently. Member McGrory suggested a cost-benefit analysis. Member Berkley reported that Rams Hill Golf Course was designed so that nearly every hole is a receptive basin. The runoff goes into a lake or into a valley and then to the aquifer. This could be considered in future development. Ms. Wylie noted that the State is currently modifying its landscape ordinance and considering storm water runoff and retention.

Mr. Bennett noted that agricultural fallowing and efficiency has been a topic for several years, and will be a key concern in the GSP. Incentives for fallowing need to be addressed. Ray Schindler asked whether fallowing would occur naturally because farmers would not receive enough water to continue. Mr. Bennett replied that planning needs to include incremental changes over time, taking the economy into consideration. The main goal of the GSA is to see a viable Borrego Valley. Member Berkley introduced a concept used extensively in China using hydroponics in enclosed buildings with solar energy. Rams Hill is already using some of these techniques, and Borrego Springs is a good place for it. Member Wilson inquired about funding for fallowing. Member Berkley pointed out that the technique is profitable, and proponents would likely approach farmers with a proposal.

Mr. Bennett presented the question, how do you envision land use for Borrego Springs in the year 2040? The County General Plan did not anticipate SGMA, and the projected build-out is unviable given the future reduction in available groundwater. This is an important component of the GSP, requiring input from the community. Ms. Wylie recommended that the A/C members review the Borrego Springs Community Plan prior to the next meeting. Member Falk reported that the Borrego Springs Community Sponsor Group received a lot of public input on the proposed "Rudyville" development, which if approved would increase density in Borrego Springs. The citizens asked how additional homes can be approved when the community is experiencing a water crisis.

Member Berkley inquired about the feasibility of sewer reclamation and how many homes in Borrego Springs are connected to sewer. Mr. Poole replied that there are approximately 800 homes connected, not enough for practical reclamation. In addition, many of the connected homes are vacant half the year or more. However, BWD is currently studying tertiary treatment.

Member Lawrence stated for the record that in 2040, from the perspective of the Stewardship Council, their vision is for a thriving village which serves as a hospitality hub for a world-class nature destination, and a comprehensive plan will be developed by the GSP process.

Mr. Bennett explained that the County began using the concept of fallowing actively irrigated land in 2004 to mitigate water use by new development. BWD currently has a 4 to 1 mitigation ratio. The County has not changed its current 1 to 1 mitigation ratio, and is looking to develop changes as part of the GSP process with input from the community. A concept discussed was that by 2040 there will be durable water entitlements for water uses in Borrego Springs. Dudek has commenced an audit of the

County's and BWD's water credit program. Ms. Wylie reviewed her notes from Mr. Bennett's presentation and will work with Wendy Quinn to incorporate them into the Minutes. They are attached and incorporated by this reference.

Item #5:

General Comment from A/C Members

Referring to a presentation proposed by Member Lawrence, President Hart announced that any written material presented by A/C members must be distributed with the agenda package. Director Brecht requested that the item be included in the next agenda. Member Dodd pointed out that as the ratepayer representative, he does not have a formal nominating organization but has been working with Mr. Poole and welcomed interested parties to meet with him following today's A/C meeting. Mr. Schindler suggested using his ratepayer group, and Mr. Poole welcomed his participation.

Item #6:

General Public Comment

Tom Beltran referred to Member Berkley's comments about capturing recharge and cited issues relative to the Salton Sea Reclamation Act and the Clean Water Act and flows through the San Felipe wash into the basin. He felt SGMA could be preempted by federal law, and court action relative to the Salton Sea was possible, which would delay the GSP. Ms. Wylie asked Mr. Poole to serve as a point of contact for members of the public wishing to submit written comments. Dennis Jensen asked whether there would be a place for agriculture in the Borrego Valley at buildout, other than to supply water credits.

Item #7:

Next Steps and Closing Remarks

Ms. Wylie will work with Mr. Poole to schedule a date for the next A/C meeting. The agenda will include By-Laws, organizational questions, Member Lawrence's presentation regarding the Stewardship Council, a presentation by Dudek, and more conversations on the GSP. Ms. Wylie agreed to prepare something regarding meeting protocol. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:55 p.m.



AGENDA ITEM #2 = GSP AC By-Laws
BORREGO VALLEY
GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY PLAN



ADVISORY COMMITTEE
BY-LAWS
Draft 04-10-17 AC Meeting Edits

Adopted and approved at the _____, 2017 Borrego Valley GSP Advisory Committee Meeting:

Article 1 PURPOSE AND FORMATION of the ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Section A – On September 20, 2016, the Board of Directors of the Borrego Water District (District) approved a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the County of San Diego (County) and the District, which memorialized each agency’s role and responsibilities for developing a Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) for the Borrego Valley Groundwater Basin (Borrego Basin). On October 19, 2016, the Board of Supervisors of the County also approved the MOU, thereby establishing a multiple-agency Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) responsible for developing and implementing a GSP for the Borrego Basin. The MOU establishes a Core Team comprised of County and District staff tasked with coordinating the activities of the Borrego Basin GSP Advisory Committee (AC).

Section B – In consideration of the interests of all beneficial uses and users of groundwater in the basin, stakeholder engagement and education of both stakeholders and the general public will be conducted in part via the deliberations of the AC pursuant to California Water Code Section 10723.2. The purpose of the AC is to provide input to aid in the development of the planning and policy recommendations contained in the GSP. As information supporting the GSP is prepared by the GSA, these items will be brought before the AC for discussion, analysis, and recommendations.

Section C – The AC is a non-partisan, non-sectarian, non-profit advisory organization. The AC is not empowered by ordinance, establishing authority, or policy to render a binding decision of any kind.

Section D – The AC is advisory to the Core Team. The Core Team will develop a GSP that meets the requirements of SGMA and is acceptable to the District and to the County. The GSP shall include, but not be limited to, groundwater use enforcement measures, a detailed breakdown of

each GSA Party's responsibilities for Plan implementation, anticipated costs of implementing the Plan, and cost recovery mechanisms, if necessary.

Article 2 MEMBERSHIP AND TERM OF OFFICE

Section A – The AC shall consist of individuals with backgrounds in developing, deliberating, planning, and/or advocating for sustainable use of groundwater in the Borrego Basin, under the requirements of SGMA.

Section B – The AC is limited to nine (9) members as established in the MOU. Potential representatives shall be nominated by the following six (6) Stakeholder Organizations and shall be apportioned as follows:

- (1) Four members nominated by the Borrego Water Coalition and filling the following representative roles- 1 agricultural member; 1 recreation member; 1 independent pumper; 1 at large member,
- (2) One member nominated by the Borrego Springs Community Sponsor Group,
- (3) One member nominated by the Borrego Valley Stewardship Council,
- (4) One member nominated by the Borrego Water District Board of Directors who is not an employee or elected official –to represent ratepayers/property owners,
- (5) One member nominated by the County of San Diego who is not an employee or elected official –to represent the Farm Bureau, and
- (6) One member nominated by the California State Parks, Colorado Desert Region – to represent the Anza-Borrego Desert State Park.

Each person nominated to the AC by the above Stakeholder Organizations must be endorsed by the Board of Directors of the District and the Director of Planning & Development Services (PDS) of the County before serving on the AC. Substitution of an alternate for an endorsed AC Member is not permitted. Only endorsed Members may serve on the AC.

Section C – Each AC Member shall serve a term, which shall run concurrently with the development and completion of the GSP.

Section D - A vacancy shall be recognized for any AC Member who: (1) dies; (2) resigns; (3) has unexcused absences from more than three of the scheduled AC meetings within a single calendar year; (4) misses three meetings in a row; (5) regularly fails to abide by the discussion covenants of the AC; (6) violates the Ralph M. Brown Act; or (7) fails to exercise the purpose and authority of the AC as described in Article 1 above. The AC shall notify the Core Team if a position is deemed vacant [pursuant to items 1-4 above, or if the AC recommends the removal of a member as related to items 5-7 above](#). If a vacancy occurs, the Stakeholder Organization may nominate another AC member appointee for that position that must then be endorsed by the District Board and County Director of PDS. The new appointee member shall serve through the development and completion of the GSP.

Article 3 DUTIES

The AC shall have the following duties and responsibilities:

- (1) Serve as a resource to the Core Team on GSP development issues for the Borrego Basin;
- (2) Advise in the formation of the planning and policy recommendations to be included in the GSP. This may include reviewing technical materials and providing comment, data, and relevant local information to the GSA related to Plan development; assisting in communicating concepts and requirements to the stakeholder constituents that they represent; providing comments on materials and reports prepared; assisting the Core Team to anticipate short- and long-term future events that may impact groundwater sustainability, trends and conditions that will impact groundwater management;
- (3) Participate in AC and Core Team public decision-making meetings, expected to occur on an approximately quarterly basis or as needed during GSP development.

Article 4 STRUCTURE

Section A – [AC meetings will be chaired by a facilitator from the California State University, Sacramento, Center for Collaborative Policy \(“CCP”\) or other such facilitator acceptable to the Core](#)

~~Team. If the Facilitator cannot for any reason act as chair at a particular meeting, At the start of each AC meeting,~~ members shall determine who among the Committee will chair that particular meeting, or have an opportunity to request District or County staff to run the meeting.

Section B – The designated ~~Chairperson convener~~ shall provide general ~~supervisory~~ guidance to the AC, certify the presence of a quorum, and preside over each meeting.

Section C– ~~AC meetings may be led by a Facilitator from the California State University, Sacramento, Center for Collaborative Policy (“CCP”) or other such facilitator acceptable to the Core Team.~~

Section ~~DC~~– If utilized, the Facilitator shall provide general guidance to the AC and facilitate its meetings. The Facilitator, in consultation with the AC, shall assign coordinating duties and/or specific tasks to subcommittees of the AC as necessary.

Section ~~ED~~– The District shall assign staff to record the minutes of all AC meetings, maintain a list of all active representatives, handle committee correspondence, and keep records of actions as they occur at each meeting. It is the responsibility of the Core Team staff assigned to the AC to assure that posting of meeting notices in a publicly accessible place for 72 hours prior to an AC meeting, to keep a record of such posting, and to reproduce and distribute the AC notices and minutes of all meetings.

Article 5 ORGANIZATIONAL PROCEDURES

Section A – Robert’s Rules of Order govern the operation of the AC in all cases not covered by these by-laws, the AC may formulate specific procedural rules of order to govern the conduct of its meetings.

Section B – Any voting is on the basis of one vote per AC member. No proxy or absentee voting is permitted.

Section C – All AC recommendations regarding the GSP shall be made by consensus. Consensus is achieved when AC participants indicate that they are at Levels 1-4 (not Levels 5 or 6) as described below. If after multiple attempts, the AC deems consensus improbable among the AC

members on a particular matter, the issue will be returned to the Core Team without a recommendation.

Levels of consensus are as follows:

1. I can say an **unqualified 'yes'** to the decision. I am satisfied that the decision is an expression of the wisdom of the group.
2. I find the decision **acceptable**. It is the best of the real options we have available to us.
3. I can **live with** the decision. However, I'm not enthusiastic about it.
4. I do not fully agree with the decision and need to register my view about it. However, I do not choose to block the decision and will **stand aside**. I am willing to support the decision because I trust the wisdom of the group.

~~I do not agree with the decision and feel the need to **block** the decision being accepted as consensus.~~

5. ~~I feel that we have no clear sense of unity in the group. We We -need to **do more work** before consensus can be achieved.~~

6. I do not agree with the decision and feel the need to **block** the decision being accepted as consensus.

Section D – AC meetings shall be held under the following discussion covenants:

- ~~What is past is past —~~ Focus on the future as much as possible.
- All perspectives are valued. You are not required to defend your perspective, but you are asked to share it and to provide supporting rationale.
- All ideas have value. If you believe another approach is better, offer it as a constructive alternative.
- Everyone will have an equal opportunity to participate.

- Everyone will be encouraged to talk.
- One person speaks at a time.
- No side conversations.
- View disagreements as problems to be solved rather than battles to be won.
- Avoid ascribing motives to or judging the actions of others. Please speak about your experiences, concerns, and suggestions. Treat each other with respect.
- Avoid right-wrong paradigms.
- When communicating outside of the AC, Members are asked to speak only for themselves when asked about AC progress unless there has been adoption of concepts or recommendations by the full body.

Section E – A majority of the AC members currently appointed shall constitute a quorum. A quorum is required for an Official Meeting to occur. No consensus vote of the AC shall be considered as reflecting an official recommendation by the AC unless a vote was taken at an Official Meeting.

Section F – All meetings of the AC and its subcommittees are open to the public to the extent required by the Ralph M. Brown Act. Meetings are to be held in accessible, public places in Borrego Springs, California. Notice of all AC meetings shall be posted in a publicly accessible place for a period of 72 hours prior to the meeting. A majority of the AC members shall not use a series of communications of any kind, directly or through intermediaries, to discuss, deliberate, or take action on any AC-related business outside of a public meeting in violation of the Ralph M. Brown Act.

Section G –All members of the AC must abide by these by-laws. The County and District reserve the right to remove members that do not abide by the by-laws.

Article 6 COMPENSATION

Members of the AC shall serve without compensation.

AGENDA ITEM #3 – Review and Discussion of Draft AC Agenda Development Schedule and Interaction with Constituent Group (CG)

ORGANIZATIONAL QUESTIONS TO BE CONSIDERED BY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

BORREGO BASIN ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

DRAFT - APRIL 10, 2017

Organizational process for Constituent meetings

Develop an email list of interested parties

Decide where and when to conduct meetings

Determine meeting format – public or private

Develop a simple explanation of the Brown Act

Decide who group recommendations will be created: Consensus, voting or majority recommendations

Decide whether minutes of discussions are appropriate

Create a written format for bringing recommendations to AC

Decide on a process for AC to review recommendations that weren't followed

Organizational process for AC member providing information to Constituent group (CG)

AC provides opportunity for questions from constituents at each AC meeting

Not all constituents can attend. How is information provided and by whom?

AC provides a written overview of the issues discussed at the meeting through in timely AC meeting minutes. Is that sufficient?

Decide how to communicate with CG

AC meeting minutes - specific enough?

Informative emails - who drafts?

Decide how an AC members can get clarification on issues

AC sends to the Core or Consultant or Mediator?

Answered by email or conference calls between Core, Consultant or Mediator

Decide how CG members can get clarification on issues

Attend AC meeting

AC provides clarification after contacting Core, Consultant or Mediator?

Draft - AC organization of CG

AGENDA ITEM #3 – Review and Discussion of Draft AC Agenda Development Schedule and Interaction with Constituent Group (CG)

Basic Principles of Operation for AC Engagement with Core Team and Constituent Groups

05-04-17 Draft

- Points of Contact for AC:
 - *Primary:* Geoff Poole, BWD, Core Team (CT): Geoff@borregowd.org
 - *Secondary:* Meagan Wylie, Facilitator: mwylie@ccp.csus.edu

PROCEDURE FOR AC MEETING PREPARATIONS:

- CT, along with Facilitator, will prepare draft agenda.
- If an AC member has materials to share at an upcoming AC meeting, or an item to be agendized for discussion, contact Mr. Poole and the Facilitator with the request at minimum **10 business days** in advance of the meeting.
- Draft agenda will be posted to both the BWD and County Websites, and physically outside of the meeting venue, no later than 72 hours before the scheduled meeting.
 - <http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/pds/SGMA/borrego-valley.html>
 - <http://borregowd.org/Sustainability.php>
- CT will make every attempt to also finalize and post associated meeting materials 72 hours in advance of the scheduled meeting. Any materials that are not posted as part of the current meeting agenda packet may be shared at the meeting as “informational items,” and will be included as part of the subsequent meeting’s agenda packet.

Sample Timeline:

- 8-15 Business Day Out:
 - CT/CCP/consultants prepare AC Meeting Materials and finalization of draft AC Meeting Minutes
 - CT/CCP prepare draft meeting agenda
- 4-8 Business Days Out:
 - CT Finalizes Agenda/ Agenda Package
 - Agenda sent to County for Posting to Website*
- 72 hours Out:
 - Agenda must be posted to website
 - Agenda posted at physical location of meeting

MON	TUES	WED	THUR	FRI	SAT	SUN	
AC sends any Agenda Topics or Materials to CT/CCP		CT/CCP edits agenda and materials	CT/CCP edits agenda and materials	Final Agenda to County by AM for post			
MON	TUES	WED	THUR	FRI	SAT	SUN	MON
		<u>Preferred:</u> Agenda Posted by 10:00 am		<u>Required:</u> Agenda Posted by 10:00 am			AC Meeting at 10:00 am

- *The process for posting to the County website can take several business days. Please be advised that the County does not conduct business over the weekend.
- Once materials are available, the AC will receive email notification from either Mr. Poole or the Facilitator.

GETTING QUESTIONS ANSWERED & CORRESPONDING WITH YOUR CONSTITUENT GROUPS

- Geoff Poole is your first line of communication. If you have a question related to the AC and/or the AC's responsibilities, please ask Mr. Poole directly. Mr. Poole can assist with items related to the following:
 - Process questions
 - IT-related questions
 - Contact Lists
 - Getting clarification on certain SGMA-related issues
 - Providing direction on where to find information, materials, etc.
 - Finding the right subject matter expert to enquire with, if he cannot answer your question directly
- Mr. Poole has also offered to attend meetings of your constituent groups as a resource for information sharing.

Borrego Valley Stewardship Council

TO: Borrego Water District Board of Directors
County of San Diego SGMA Project Team c/o Jim Bennett

Date: September 15, 2016 DELIVERY VIA EMAIL

THE BORREGO VALLEY STEWARDSHIP COUNCIL CALLS FOR EMBRACING SUSTAINABLE GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT ACT (SGMA) REQUIREMENTS BY CONSIDERING THE FOLLOWING:

Subsequent to the submittal of the Borrego Water District's (District's) and San Diego County's (County's) notice to become Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSA's), the Borrego Valley Stewardship Council (Stewardship Council), has engaged with representatives of San Diego County's Department of Planning and Development Services (P&DS), and expressed the following concerns and recommendations:

Anza-Borrego Desert State Park (ABDSP) and the town of Borrego Springs together serve as a regional economic engine for world-class tourism that has not yet been fully recognized.

There is an historic divide between ABDSP and the town of Borrego Springs that dates back to the vision of Borrego Valley founders such as James Copley and Alfonse A. Burnand who saw the Valley as a "donut hole" in the middle of the Park—a donut hole distinct from the Park and ripe for developing a San Diego version of Palm Springs. At the core of the 1950's-style donut hole vision is a water intensive economy dependent on agriculture, real estate development, speculation, and land sales.

The creation of the Stewardship Council and its adoption of a Geotourism Charter were spurred by the current water crisis in the Borrego Valley. The Council's intention is to bridge the divide between the State Park and Community by taking a fresh look at a sustainable economy in the context of the realities of water availability, clean air, habitat preservation and human health.

From a series of community workshops sponsored by the Stewardship Council it has become clear that tourism and its related development, not land speculation and residential subdivisions, must become the central economic driver for Borrego Springs, not simply to comply with SGMA, but to survive as a community.

There is a growing desire to embrace and foster Borrego Spring as "The Heart of the Park" as opposed to a "donut hole for development."

Working with representatives from the National Geographic's Geotourism program the Stewardship Council has begun to facilitate a community dialogue to define how best to develop a "Heart of the Park" campaign. Central to the campaign are developing Geotourism as the primary source of economic growth and strategically positioning Borrego Springs as a village of hamlets with a commercial core that serves as the hospitality hub for a world-class natural

science destination.

Strengthening partnership affiliations with the National Geographic Society, the California State Parks, the UNESCO World Heritage program, and the San Diego Tourism Authority are central to cultivating a new Geotourism economy.

The Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) that will be created by the GSA's must address and move beyond the 1950's-inspired land use assumptions that are enshrined in the current Borrego Valley Community Plan.

The GSP must also clearly reflect the need to evolve the current business promotional practices from a traditional Chamber-of-Commerce-style marketing plan to a Geotourism inspired Destination Management Organization (DMO) – joining the Anza-Borrego region to a network of world-class, UNESCO-recognized, sustainable destinations.

The District has pointed out that the implementation of SGMA in the Borrego Valley will impact more than hydrology and land use; and that in fact, the implementation of SGMA will have broad economic, cultural, and social implications for the Anza-Borrego region. Simply stated, there are many possible pathways to arrive at a SGMA-mandated, “no undesirable results” reduction in water usage in the Borrego Valley, some of which would be economically deleterious, some of which could result in a vibrant economic engine for the entire region.

Understanding that both the County and the District have limited resources to address all the complex and interdependent issues involved in creating a GSP for Borrego Springs in a holistic fashion, the Stewardship Council has not only volunteered to be one of the members of the GSP Advisory Group, but also has offered to serve as a neutral convener to help facilitate a fresh look at land use for a sustainable economy for the Borrego Valley.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Lawrence, David Garmon, Dick Troy, and Travis Huxman
Co-Conveners, Borrego Valley Stewardship Council