

Mojave Region Update of Integrated Regional Water Management Plan

Stakeholder Group Meeting #7 – Summary

February 6, 2014

Mojave Water Agency Headquarters
Apple Valley, CA

Meeting Purpose and Overview

This was the seventh of nine scheduled meetings of the Stakeholder Group for the Update of the Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan for the Mojave Region. Objectives for the meeting were to:

- Provide a status update of the IRWM Plan document
- Provide a status update of the Salt Nutrient Management Plan
- Discuss the update of the MWA Groundwater Management Plan
- Discuss final steps for adoption of the IRWM Plan
- Update approach to developing Finance section of Plan
- Finalize Project Lists
- Finalize Plan Performance Monitoring and Reporting
- Introduce Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment

The meeting discussions revolved around the status of the Mojave Integrated Regional Water Management Plan and other related plans, the latest projects recommended for inclusion in the Plan, and finalizing criteria for monitoring performance of the Plan upon its implementation.

There were forty-nine individuals in attendance at the meeting as indicated during the introductions. Ken Kirby, of EVOTO Company and a member of the Consultant Team, served as the facilitator for the meeting.

Introductions

Scott Weldy, Chairman of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to the Mojave Water Agency (MWA), opened the meeting with introductions by all those in attendance followed by approval of the December 16, 2013 Stakeholder Meeting Summary. Mr. Weldy turned the meeting over to Ken Kirby who then provided a brief overview of the agenda and stated that this would be the last meeting in which new topics and plan content would be introduced to the group. There were no comments or questions from

the group at this point and Mr. Kirby continued by providing an overview of the Code of Conduct for the meeting.

Mojave Integrated Regional Water Management Plan – Status Update

Plan Completion

Sandra Carlson, a member of the consultant team, provided a brief status of the Plan document:

- First four sections of the Plan have been completed and are available for public review on the project website.
- Sections 5 through 8 to be completed and available for review by February 14, 2014.
- Sections 9 through 12 are in draft form. Discussions and input from the group during this meeting will inform the remaining sections of the Plan. The remaining sections are projected to be completed and available for internal review by the Stakeholder Group by April 2014.
- Complete draft of the IRWM Plan to be available for review and comment by May 12, 2014.
- Draft Plan sections addressing the expanded boundary areas are under review and pending comments from the agencies within those expanded areas.

Governance

Ms. Carlson also proposed making the Project List an Appendix to the Plan in order to facilitate and streamline amendment of projects and project priorities without requiring formal re-adoption or amendment of the Plan. Revisions to the project list would still require discussion with the Stakeholder Group and the decision making process as previously described.

Comments/Questions:

- Can new projects be added at any point, or do they need to wait until the Plan is updated?
 - o Whichever method the group would like to do it will work. The intent is to allow amendment of the projects without a full amendment to the Plan that requires formal adoption.
- Would this include changing a project in Tier 3 to Tier 1?
 - o Yes, any changes to the project list, including priority, would be included in this process.
- Is there a potential downside such as projects slipping onto the project list without the agencies knowing?

- No. Changes to the project list would still require discussion with the Stakeholder Group and the decision making process as previously described.
- To maintain transparency and openness to input, the Plan should clearly define the process for updating the project list.
 - The Plan already includes a description of the process for amendment of projects. The Project Team is only proposing that adoption of the amendments to the project list would not require that the entire IRWM Plan be revised and readopted. Instead, the updated project list could be appended to the existing plan using the existing decision making process. All of the steps for amending the project list will remain (how the decisions will be made, call for projects, public notice).

The group was in favor of making the project list an appendix to the Plan in order to streamline the process for adding new projects to the Plan in the future.

Salt Nutrient Management Plan Status

Lance Eckhart, from MWA staff, provided a brief update on the status of the Salt Nutrient Management Plan:

Recent activities

- Establishment of a comprehensive water quality database for the Region.
- Development of an analytical approach, that has been reviewed and approved by the Regional Boards, to represent the accumulation of salts, total dissolved solids, and nitrates in the groundwater basin.
- With Regional Board buy-in to the proposed approach, we are now proceeding with the analysis (the regional modeling).

Timelines

- The timeline for the Salt Nutrient Management Plan is different from the IRWM Plan, so the SNMP will be adopted through a separate process.
- Adoption of the Salt Nutrient Management Plan is set for September 2014, to coincide with the Lahontan and Colorado RWQCBs adoption schedule of their Basin Regional Management Plan Updates.

Jurisdiction

- The Mojave Planning Area overlaps the jurisdictions of two of the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCB); the Lahontan RWQCB and the Colorado River RWQCB.

Current Modeling Boundaries

- The model used for the SNM Plan is based on hydrogeology and groundwater quality within the two major basins – Mojave River Groundwater Basin and Morongo Basin.
- Building on 2007 model which measures the accumulation of TDS or salts in the groundwater basins.
- Modeling improvements since 2007
 - Include nitrate accumulation in addition to salts.
 - Increased knowledge of geology – better definition of mixing that can be expected to occur based on the depth of wells instead of the geologic depths the basins.
 - Recent and advanced modeling efforts for surrounding areas are included.
 - More robust water quality data available.
 - Back testing of model to check validity of the results.
- The model will identify trends by simulating the balance of salts over a projected 70 year time period if nothing is done to change the current operational trends, and can also assess whether a proposed project will add to or reduce the accumulation of salts and nutrients.
- Modeling helps to improve understanding of conditions within the groundwater basins past, present, and future (i.e. identify variability of water quality within basins).
- The model will help improve management of the basins to improve water quality throughout the Region.

Comments/Questions:

- With the variability of concentration of salts and nutrients in the areas, is the point of the Salt and Nutrient Management Plan to identify point sources that may be causing over-concentration in certain areas?
 - o The model is intended to help identify big changes and trends of water conditions over time in the various basins. A better understanding of the activities within the basins will help agencies identify appropriate regulatory tools and projects to manage specific areas in the Region. It's up to the regulatory agencies to decide how they will use these tools.
- Why were nutrients added to the salt model? What does this do for us in the future?
 - o Directive to include nutrients in the salt models resulted from an effort to expedite the use of recycled water and increase water conservation.

- The purpose of the Salt and Nutrient Management Plan is to provide information to the regulatory bodies to help them understand the current conditions of water in the basins and provide a projection of what will happen based on known inputs using the models.

NOTE: The Salt and Nutrient Management Plan, including the modeling of salt and nutrients, is intended to provide information and help identify cause and effect in relation to development. The Regional Board is asking for this data and information for purpose of analysis.

- Do the Regional Boards have consistent guidelines and standards across the State?
 - The Basin Plans drive the standards from region to region. There are nine regions in the State. These Basin Plans vary depending on local and regional conditions.
- How will the Regional Boards use this information and set expectations?
 - The Regional Boards expect to use this information to provide valuable context about the entire Region and within basins and sub-basins as they address questions about specific locations. They may have to conduct additional analysis to assess specific problem areas and identify potential solutions.
- This effort is funded by Victor Valley Wastewater Reclamation Authority through the RWQCB (via fines, etc.) as a Supplemental Environmental Project (SEP).

Mojave Water Agency Ground Water Management Plan Update

Ken Kirby indicated that a Ground Water Management Plan was prepared in conjunction with the Integrated Regional Water Management Plan in 2004, and therefore this effort to update the IRWM Plan in 2014 also includes an update of the Groundwater Management Plan to stay current and meet new requirements from the State. Mr. Kirby clarified that the Groundwater Management Plan is under the purview of Mojave Water Agency and not the Regional Water Management Group, which is guiding the Salt and Nutrient Management Plan and the IRWM Plan. However, it will be available for all the water districts in the area and so they are invited to participate.

Goals of the Groundwater Management Plan:

- Increase awareness of groundwater quality.
- Increase coordination among the agencies in the Region.

- Improve the management of water resources.
- A groundwater management plan is required to qualify for State funding for groundwater projects.
- Tool to help meet the California Statewide Groundwater Elevation Monitoring requirements.

The Project Team proposes that the objectives of the IRWM Plan be used for the Groundwater Management Plan Update as they are relevant and meet the State's requirements (see Handout #1 Proposed Groundwater Management Plan Basin Management Objectives). The Stakeholder Group agreed that the objectives developed for the IRWM Plan are appropriate for the GWM Plan.

Schedule for Completion of IRWM Plan

Mr. Kirby reviewed the IRWM Plan schedule for January 2014 through June 2014 (see Handout #2 Schedule of Important Events to Complete Mojave IRWM Plan and Companion Documents). At this point, the upcoming schedule of activities reflects the fact that after today's meeting we are no longer developing new content for the Plan but are now moving forward towards final review and adoption of the Plan. The Final IRWM Plan is expected to be presented at the 9th Stakeholder Meeting, scheduled for June 23. After that date Regional Water Management Group members and project proponents will be asked to adopt the Mojave IRWM Plan at their earliest convenience.

Revisions to the schedule include the following:

- February 14: Comments due from Stakeholder Meeting #7 and IRWM Plan Sections 5-8. *Due date changed to February 21.*
- Since additional review and preparation of the Salt and Nutrient Management Plan is needed, the schedules for the Salt and Nutrient Management Plan and the IRWM Plan will no longer coincide. *The time frames reflected in the Schedule will be revised.*

Project Financing Discussion

Kathy Cortner, Chief Financial Officer for the MWA, discussed the intended financial aspects of the IRWM Plan. In compliance with the California Water Code, projects in the IRWM Plan must provide specific financing information. The Project Team is developing a form to get financial information about projects, their budgets, and financing options. The information will be used to identify funding resources and prepare the Financing section of the Plan. The form should be available March 3, 2014.

NOTE: While all the projects in the Plan should complete the form by providing as much financial information as possible, Projects in Tier 1 are expected to fully complete the form because at this point they are the highest priority projects in the Region and are expected to proceed in the near future.

Comments/Questions:

- How is this going to work for projects like Project 1003 Assistance Programs for Small System Improvements which is made up of several individual entities?
 - o That program was created to capture all the proposed small water system improvement projects. As individual projects become more fully defined, then they will be pulled out of that Project 1003 umbrella and ranked accordingly.
- How is this applicable for conceptual projects?
 - o The forms can be completed with as much information that is known. If there is no information, or it is still being figured out, then that should be indicated on the form.
- Do projects in Tier 3 also need to provide budget information?
 - o It can be provided later. As projects move up in priority ranking then the detailed budget information becomes more critical and the form should be filled out.
- Regarding the proposed Cadiz project, if budget information is provided and funding is secured, would the project be moved up in ranking from Tier 3?
 - o The proposed Cadiz project is up for discussion by the group later in the meeting. While it is recommended to be included in the Plan as a Tier 3 project, the group has yet to discuss and formally decide whether to include the project in the Plan.
- If a project does not provide budget information, will it lose its priority ranking?
 - o It is preferred that the information be provided as soon as possible. In order for projects to go beyond conceptual or plan stages, a budget will eventually be needed in order to move forward.

Finalizing the Project List

Mr. Kirby provided a recap of the screening and review process for projects, and of changes made to the Project List since the previous Stakeholder meeting on December 16, 2013 (see Handouts 3a-3c). This included a new project submitted from Running Springs Water (Project No. 130) and additional information submitted by the project sponsor for

the proposed Cadiz Valley Water Conservation, Recovery, and Storage Project. Before these projects were reviewed, there was a discussion concerning projects that may benefit disadvantaged communities (DACs).

Comments/Questions:

- What is the difference between Disadvantaged and Severely Disadvantaged Communities, and why aren't Severely Disadvantaged Communities included in the Plan?
 - o The Plan was developed using the description and criteria of a Disadvantaged Community prescribed by the Department of Water Resources (DWR) as they relate to the Integrated Regional Water Management Plan. DWR does not differentiate between Severely Disadvantaged and Disadvantaged Communities. If a project addresses critical water supply or water quality needs of a Disadvantaged Community, then that project could qualify for 100% financing from DWR after the project is completed – it is reimbursable funding.
 - o Different organizations that are administering financial assistance programs for projects have their own criteria for funding and some of those include a distinction between Severely Disadvantaged and Disadvantaged Communities. The IRWM Plan is being developed under the DWR purview for funding and is therefore using their guidelines regarding Disadvantaged Communities. However, Prop 84 funds as offered by DWR are just one funding source and there are other sources available to projects particularly for those in a Disadvantaged Community. Inclusion in the IRWM Plan can help a project qualify for a variety of funding programs and projects proponents are encouraged to explore those options in addition to Prop 84.

Project 130 Sewer Lift Stations Nos. 1 and 3 Improvements (Running Springs Water District)

During the last Stakeholder Meeting on December 15, 2013, a special call for projects was made to accommodate the submission of potential projects from proponents in the IRWM Plan boundary expansion areas on or before January 15, 2014. One additional project from the recently included areas was submitted for review and inclusion in the IRWM Plan: Project 130 Sewer Lift Stations Nos. 1 and 3 Improvements (Running Springs Water District). A representative from the Running Springs Water District explained that the project was designed to protect the headwaters of Deep Creek from a possible overflow

from two sewer lift stations. The project was recommended to be included with a priority of Tier 2: high importance, medium urgency. Mr. Kirby explained that he had made this initial recommendation based on a review of the project submittal as a starting point for conversation. The Stakeholder Group agreed with the recommendations as proposed.

Project 12 Cadiz Valley Water Conservation, Recovery, and Storage Project

Mr. Kirby explained that during the original screening process for projects, Project 12 Cadiz Valley Water Conservation, Recovery, and Storage Project was screened out due to a lack of information. During the December 16, 2013 meeting, the Stakeholders group asked the project representative to submit additional information needed for the review process so it could be considered for inclusion in the IRWM Plan by the group at today's February 6, 2014 meeting. Additional project details were provided by the project representative:

- The proposed project for the Mojave IRWM Plan includes a subset of the overall proposed Cadiz Valley Water Conservation, Recovery, and Storage Project.
- Under the proposed project for the IRWM Plan, groundwater extractions would occur outside of the Mojave Planning Area and would be imported into the Mojave Planning Area via two pipelines.
- Santa Margarita Water District was the lead agency for the overall Cadiz project and certified the EIR.
- San Bernardino County approved the associated Groundwater Management Plan and is responsible for the onsite monitoring of the groundwater at the Cadiz site.
- The proposed project for the Mojave IRWM Plan involves two potential pipelines between Cadiz and the Mojave Region.
- The overall Cadiz project is expected to be able to deliver 50,000 acre/feet of water per year to potential future project partners and at least 20% of this amount (i.e. 10,000 acre/feet) has been committed for the benefit of San Bernardino County

Meeting participants were given the opportunity to ask questions regarding the proposed project at this point.

Questions:

- Is the inter-basin transfer of water OK with the State, i.e. transferring water out of one basin into another?
 - o Yes, both surface water and groundwater can be transferred. The Mojave Region already receives and uses significant amounts of water from outside the Region through the State Water Project.
- Based on the screening criteria for the projects, what agency from the Mojave Region is identified as the project proponent?

- The criteria we used for the update of the Mojave IRWM Plan does not require that a project proponent has to be local, just that each project must have a qualified proponent that can carry the project forward. A local agency has not yet been identified as project proponent for the project submittal.
- Mr. Floyd Wicks (the Cadiz project representative present at the Stakeholder meeting) stated that there is a high degree of interest in the potential project. However none within the Mojave Region have committed to participate in the project at this time.
- What are the project benefits to the Mojave Region, specifically?
 - Mr. Wicks stated that the project would dedicate at least 10,000 acre/feet exclusively to the county. If a local agency within the Planning Area expressed interest in participating in the project, Mr. Wicks reported that he believes there is a strong likelihood that county leadership would support the Cadiz project water committed for use in San Bernadino County be for the Mojave Region given the water constraints and high needs in the area.
 - The project could add an additional source of reliable water supply to the Mojave Region during a period when the State Water Project and other sources of water are becoming increasingly uncertain.
- How much of the Cadiz project water is committed to the Santa Margarita Water District given the assumption that this project is largely financed by them? And, how much water is truly available after that commitment is fulfilled?
 - Mr. Wicks explained that the project is not directly financed by the Santa Margarita Water District but rather the pipeline between Cadiz and the Colorado Aqueduct is. They have committed to purchase 5,000 acre feet with an option to go up to 15,000 acre feet of the total 50,000 acre feet. There are other utility companies that have signed up to purchase water from the project (Golden State Water will purchase 5,000 acre feet).
- Has there been a resolution to discrepancies in the project's hydrological reports for the Cadiz Basin?
 - Mr. Wicks indicated that they weren't sure what the discrepancies are. If there is a specific issue in question we can find out.
- How long have you (Mr. Wicks) been on the project's management team and how often has it changed hands in the past year?
 - Mr. Wicks stated that he has been on retainer for the project for two years. He is not an employee of Cadiz. He represents Cadiz as

- a consultant, and has been hired to oversee the engineering analysis for the project.
- Is the 10,000 acre feet of the project's water that is committed to San Bernardino County 20% of the total project water or only a portion of that 20%?
 - o The project is presented as a 50,000 acre foot project. 20% is 10,000 acre feet.
- If an entity in this area wanted to contract with Cadiz for water, how quickly could the project move water to this area?
 - o Mr. Wicks stated that currently, delivery of water from the Cadiz project is projected to take place in year 30 of the project, but if needed it could be supplied in approximately two years.
- Is that 10,000 acre feet of water dedicated to all of San Bernardino County or to the Mojave Region?
 - o Mr. Wicks stated that as part of the original formulation of the project, there was a commitment that at least 20% of the water would stay in San Bernardino County. The project proposal for IRWM Plan indicated that the project could provide up to 10,000 acre feet of water to the Mojave Region if there were interested parties.
 - o There have not been discussions regarding the provision of water to the County beyond the Mojave Region.

Mr. Kirby made an initial recommendation to the Stakeholder Group that the Cadiz project be included in the Mojave IRWM Plan was based on the following assessment:

- The project meets the high priority objectives of the Plan, particularly Objective 4 to decrease reliance on the Delta.
- The project was ranked 3 on the Get Real Index because there is no vocal local supporter for the project to give it momentum to move forward.

At this point in the meeting, participants were given the opportunity to discuss the project, provide comments and express their opposition and/or support for the project.

Comments/Questions:

- Mojave Water Agency received a fax on February 6, 2014, from the Archeological Heritage Association in Needles, CA stating their opposition to including the Cadiz project in the Mojave IRWM Plan.
- Seth Shteir, a representative from the National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA) stated his group was also opposed to including the Cadiz project to be in the Mojave IRWM Plan. Reading from a letter

signed by U.S. Senator Diane Feinstein and U.S. Congressman Paul Cook, Mr. Shteir of NPCA said that their major concerns about the proposed project include that the project is highly controversial, unsustainable, and could harm the seeps and springs of the Mojave National Preserve. The project would pump 50,000 acre feet of water per year for 50 years putting a fragile desert aquifer in overdraft for the life of the project.

- Does the IRWM Plan address legal process and its impact on projects?
 - o The screening criterion for IRWM Plan projects does not include lawsuits.
- Mr. Shteir of NPCA stated that all stakeholders in the area, those directly and indirectly affected, should be given an opportunity to voice their concerns about the project and learn about potential impacts to them. The Needles community is opposed to the project due to associated potential negative impacts as are local tribes and ranchers.
- How much water is being lost via evaporation and over what time frame?
 - o Mr. Wicks stated they had estimated it to be approximately 35,000 acre feet per year. The primary reason for pumping 50,000 acre feet is to bring down the water level below the hydraulic system that transfers the water to the dry lake beds and is then evaporated.
- Mr. Shteir of NPCA stated that most of the recharge studies about the area that were not conducted in association with the project sponsor indicate that the projects' recharge estimate is 3 to 16 times too high and that the project will lead to significant depletion of water resources in the area. In addition, while perhaps not all of the seeps and streams are connected to the aquifer, there are almost certainly a few that are and further site specific analysis should be done to accurately identify and assess impacts.
- Is there new information with regard to how seeps and streams are affected by the project?
 - o Mr. Wicks stated that a more recent report has been conducted since the original 2012 studies, which indicates that there are no seeps and streams hydraulically connected to the pumping of the aquifer and therefore not a concern for the project. The report will be provided to group for their review.
- Mr. Shteir of NPCA stated that even though the previous studies were conducted in 2012 to assess conditions of the aquifer and potential impacts related to the project, the aquifer conditions haven't changed to render different conclusions in 2014. In addition, the cone of depletion

- could continue to expand for 50 years in a delayed response of the aquifer to pumping activities of the project.
- Another stakeholder suggested that a contingency list should be developed in the Plan for contentious projects with major issues of concern that may later get resolved and can then be added to the Plan, such as the Cadiz project.
 - What sort of requirements in the project have been placed on Cadiz to monitor and avoid negative impacts if any?
 - o Mr. Wicks stated that the project includes a very detailed Ground Water Management Plan. San Bernardino County is the policing agency for the project.
 - o Specific information and details about the recourse for the project if negative impacts occur will be provided to the group for their review.
 - A stakeholder noted that although the Mojave Region is challenged by cut backs from the State Water Project and diminishing natural resources, it is difficult to support a project that would export 4/5 of the water outside the area of origin for use elsewhere just to have access to 1/5 of the water supply within this Region.

Mr. Kirby closed the discussion and comment session for the Cadiz project and called for a vote from the group.

Recommendation: Include Project 12 Cadiz Valley Water Conservation, Recovery, and Storage Project in the Mojave Integrated Regional Water Management Plan as a Tier 3 project.

1st Vote: In favor of the recommendation to include Project 12 in the Plan – 14
Deny the recommendation and not include Project 12 in the Plan – 14
Include Project 12 in the Plan but at a lower priority ranking – 5

Since the decision making process emphasizes reaching broad agreement, Mr. Kirby pointed out that the show of hands indicated that the group had not yet reached broad agreement about what whether to include the proposed project in the IRWM Plan.

2nd Vote: In favor of the recommendation to include Project 12 in the Plan – 11
Deny the recommendation and not include Project 12 in the Plan – 20

Based on the second show of hands, Mr. Kirby summarized that the Stakeholder Group appeared to have reached broad agreement that the proposed Project 12 would not be included in the IRWM Plan at this time. The group concurred.

Reasons for not including the project at this time:

- Participants have concerns about the potential negative effects (from this project) on local water resources that have not been reconciled by the conflicting findings of studies conducted to date.
- There is not a local sponsor or strong proponent for the project within the Mojave Planning Region.

NOTE: Even if a project is not included in the IRWM Plan now, it could be added at a later date through the periodic review and update processes described in the Plan.

Finalize Plan Performance Monitoring and Reporting

During the previous Stakeholder Meeting on December 16, 2013, members of the Stakeholder Group and the Project Team were assigned to develop recommendations for specific targets and approaches for the Plan Performance Monitoring Objectives to finalize that portion of the Plan during this February 6, 2014 meeting.

Mr. Kirby reviewed the recommendations for targets and approaches of the Plan Performance Monitoring Objectives (see Handout 4 Updated Plan Performance Monitoring Objectives for the Mojave Integrated Regional Water Management Plan). The recommended changes and additions to the Plan Performance Monitoring Objectives were supported by the group with minor revisions made during the meeting.

The following is a list of additional revisions to the recommended criteria for evaluating the progress Plan implementation as reviewed by the group and described in the Updated Plan Performance Monitoring Objectives handout.

Objective 2- “Continue improving regional water use efficiency by implementing a portfolio of conservation actions....”

Recommendation: Accept recommended targets/criteria for 2a – 2c (reflected in the Handout 4)

Comments/Questions:

- Do these goals and targets take into account future urban growth?

- Yes, targets are based on per capita use. For example, the target for 166 gallons per person per day is based upon the total population instead of the amount of water that is pumped.
- The State's goals are 170 gallons per person per day and the IRWM Plan is looking to go beyond that with a target of 166 gallons per person per day.
- It was noted that some recent reductions in water use may be due, in part, to the economic downturn, and not just progress achieved through local conservation.
- How does this target work in areas that are predominately set up with septic systems
 - These targets are about applied water use efficiency and not return flows, and therefore not affected by the use of septic systems.

Objective 5 – “Optimize the use of the Region’s water related assets to maximize available supplies to meet projected demands ...”

The Project Team developed a target and approach for 5a and 5b, and requested assistance from the group during the meeting for 5c.

Recommendation: Develop a form/questionnaire for project proponents to provide estimated cost savings related to project improvements and efficiency that can then be compiled to estimate what the cost savings are for the Region.

Objective 8 – “Improve environmental stewardship related to waterways and water management in the Region.”

Recommendation: MWA to work with Resource Conservation District (RCD) to develop targets for 8a and 8c.

Qualitative Measurement 8b to read “Measured by the number of new and enhanced recreational projects that are connected to the environmental stewardship programs.

Add new Qualitative Measurement 8d to include constructed wetlands. Target to be one constructed wetland every 5 years.

Comments/Questions:

- Is 50 wet acres a reasonable target for 8a?
 - To be determined between MWA and Resource Conservation District (RCD).

- To avoid confusion, remove the word “new” and replace with “new and enhanced” for Qualitative Measurement 8b.
- Add a component to this objective regarding constructed wetlands to expand environmental stewardship.

Objective 10 – “Preserve water quality as it relates to local beneficial use of water supplied by each source...”

Recommendation: Remove Target and Approach 10a.

Target 10b to read “Maintain water quality objectives in the Basin Plan”.

Comments/Questions:

- Regarding target 10a, there is no tangible way to track meetings.

Objective 12 – “Improve public awareness of water supply, conservation...”

Recommendation: Remove Target and Approach 12c.

Comments/Questions:

- Target 12c is identical to 8b.

Objective 13 – “Identify and establish reliable funding sources to maintain, modernize and improve water infrastructure...”

Recommendation: Set up a subcommittee to establish criteria and targets after adoption of IRWM Plan and reference current laws that require tracking of deferred maintenance.

Comments/Questions:

- No one really tracks their deferred maintenance.
- Could we leave this blank and say it’s something to think about in the Plan?
- Current requirements (i.e. AB 240 and AB 54) are now changing with regard to tracking of deferred maintenance, especially for smaller water systems.

Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment

The IRWM Plan includes climate change considerations as required by the State guidelines. MWA, in joint effort with U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, prepared a Climate Action Plan that focused on three objectives:

- Assess future water supplies, including native surface water flows and imports
- Project potential changes in flood frequency

- Develop a green house gas emissions (GHG) inventory for the water sector. (The findings related to GHG will be included in the IRWM Plan).

Main findings and projections in the Climate Action Plan were:

- Slight declines in precipitation with large variability and increases in temperature.
- Greater decreases in native surface water flows in the future (time frame 2050 to 2070).
- 25% to 40% reduction in snow from the Sierra Nevadas.
- Slightly lower delivery from the State Water Project than estimated in previous studies.
- No change in flood flows from the Mojave River Dam and Lower Narrows in Victorville (inflows and outflows).

A checklist, per State guidelines, has been developed for the Plan to identify watershed characteristics that are vulnerable to future climate changes and help assess regional vulnerabilities (see Handout 5 Draft Climate Change Vulnerability Checklist). The completed Checklist will be included as an Appendix to the Plan.

Status Update of Proposition 84 Grant Applications

Lance Eckhart from Mojave Water Agency provided a brief update on the status of the two grant applications previously submitted for Prop 84 Round 2 grant funding.

1. Subregional Recycled Water Treatment Plants (Apple Valley and Hesperia). This project is located in the Lahontan Funding Region. Originally requested \$3 million. The project was awarded \$1.5 million. After lobbying efforts to show how the project and grant application was a collaboration of different agencies and entities and that the funding was intended to assist several projects in the Region, the award was amended to \$3 million. This \$3 funding should be available within one year.
2. Hi--Desert Water District Wastewater Treatment Plant. This project is located in the Colorado Funding Region. The project was not funded.

Wrap Up/Next Steps

Ken Kirby brought the meeting to a close by asking stakeholders to review all the discussion handouts and answer the questions on Handout 6: Summary of Requested Review, Comments and Input. Mr. Kirby reminded the group that this was the last meeting in which new information would be presented. He also asked that projects in Tier 1 complete the financial worksheet as soon as possible.

Mr. Kirby then turned the meeting over to Scott Weldy who thanked the Project Team and consultants for their efforts on the Plan. He announced that the next Stakeholder Meeting would be May 19, 2014. Mr. Weldy then thanked everyone for their participation in the process and adjourned the meeting.