

February 16, 2022

Department of Water Resources
P.O. Box 942836
Sacramento, California 94236

Subject: Prop 68 SGMA Grant – Spending Plan Package for DWR

Purpose of this Memo

This Memo has been prepared for the Department of Water Resources (DWR) to meet the requirements associated with the PSP, specifically, characterization of the PRC process. Further, this memo provides DWR with an understanding of the PRC's process as it related to the submittal of projects in excess of both \$7.6 million and \$10 million in requested funding and this memo highlights some concerns that the Borrego Water District Board (BWD) has regarding some projects and project components that are included in the Spending Plan.

PRC Process for the Borrego Water District's Application to DWR

The Borrego Water District (BWD) is the Grant Applicant to the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) Proposition (Prop) 68 Round 1 Grant Application. The Borrego Water District Board (BWD) and the Borrego Springs Watermaster (BSWM) Board worked in tandem for the development of projects for the PRC process related to the Prop 68 Application. BWD engaged in a process to solicit projects from a variety of Interested Parties. Interested Parties, along with the BWD and the BSWM, commenced the process of providing project information forms to BWD. Contemporaneously, Dudek prepared a guidance document to outline steps associated with project submittal and the project selection process consistent with the Prop 68 Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) from DWR. An abbreviated description of the Project Review Committee (PRC) process is described below.

The PRC process used the scoring criteria contained in Table 7 of the December 2021 PSP prepared by DWR in the evaluation, scoring, and ranking of projects.

Project Review Committee (PRC)– Constitution

The PRC initially comprised 11 members:

- Two members appointed by and representing the BWD/BWD Board
- Three members appointed by and representing the BSWM/Watermaster Board
- Six members who appoint one Interested Parties representative for each project; that is, each Interested Party submitting a project for consideration may designate a representative to sit on the PRC (Borrego Valley Endowment Fund [BVEF], Tubb Canyon Desert Conservancy [TCDC], Christmas Circle Community Park, Borrego Springs Unified School District, Borrego Valley Stewardship Council/Local Government Commission, De Anza Country Club)

The PRC process was facilitated by an impartial facilitator. The steps associated with the Prop 68 PRC project scoring and ranking process were outlined to provide to the Interested Parties, stakeholders, and the public with a clear explanation of the mechanics of the process and to communicate that the process must have integrity, be impartial, and achieve the most competitive suite of eligible projects for inclusion in the spending plan and grant application. The PRC used the scoring criteria contained in Table 7 of the December 2021 PSP prepared by the DWR in the evaluation, scoring, and ranking of projects.

The BWD opened the project solicitation process in December 2021 and closed the project solicitation process in January of 2022. Between December and January, the BWD and the BSWM held numerous board meetings and individual meetings with interested parties to explain the project solicitation process, to discuss the PSP, eligible project types and talk about the application.

In advance of the closure of the project solicitation, BWD convened a workshop and distributed materials for interested partners to outline the final steps associated with project submittal and the next steps associated with the Project Review Committee (PRC) process. Once the solicitation of projects closed, BWD took the following steps (as articulated in the PRC guidance document prepared by Dudek).

1. Collated all submitted projects and provided them to the PRC members, put them on the BWD website and provided them to the BSWD to post on their website.
2. Held a Zoom orientation on the PRC process and responsibilities.
3. Answered questions from the PRC members.
4. Conducted an overview of the PRC review process, preliminary scoring, and submittal of preliminary scores.

All PRC members were expected and required to be familiar with the SGMA Legislation, the Borrego Spring Groundwater Management Plan and are required to review and be familiar with DWR's SGM Grant Program SGMA Implementation Guidelines (Guidelines) ([Proposition 68 Sustainable Groundwater Grant Program 2019 Funding Guidelines \(ca.gov\)](#), December 2021) the SGM Grant Program SGMA Implementation PSP (PSP) (December 2021, ([2021 SGMA Implementation PSP \(ca.gov\)](#)). Extracted portions of the GMP, Guidelines and PSP are included in this section. Finally, BWD requested that each PRC member be score all projects (except for their own projects) consistent with Table 7 of DWRs PSP and provide preliminary scores. BWD collected all the preliminary scores from the PRC members and provided excel spreadsheets for each project with the averaged scores. i.e. BWD reviewed each individual PRC member's preliminary score, averaged all the scores per project and prepared an average score per project from review during the PRC workshops.

The PRC convened via Zoom on February 2, 2022, and February 3, 2022, to discuss preliminary project scores, ask questions to project representatives, review preliminary scores to determine if they were accurate based on the discussions held, and finalize the project list. Both meetings were open to the public, and all PRC members and project representatives were in attendance. Projects were discussed in order of project listing, with the exception of Tubb Canyon Desert Conservancy's Groundwater Dependent Ecosystem (GDE) project, which was requested to be moved up due to the potential collaboration with the BSWM.

At the February 2nd meeting, the PRC members reviewed the process, reviewed updates to project submission by the representatives, and the facilitator provided clarification related to Criterion 5 (Severely Disadvantage Community Map); specifically, that the same map may be used by all IPs. Two projects that were initially represented

by the BSWM were now represented by the San Diego County Farm Bureau (SDFB) and Agricultural Alliance for Water and Resource Education (AAWARE). One PRC member withdrew their project and removed themselves as a PRC member. This changed the number of PRC members from 11 to 10. The draft scoring sheet was updated during the meeting to reflect the PRC member's project resignation and removal as a PRC member. Eight projects—BWD Advanced Meter Infrastructure (AMI); BWD Solar; BWD Wastewater Treatment Plant Monitoring Wells; BSWM Biological Restoration of Fallowed Lands; BSWM GDE Monitoring Program; BSWM Monitoring, Reporting, and Groundwater Management Plan (GMP) Update; and TCDC GDE Identification, Assessment, and Monitoring—were discussed, and all PRC members were given adequate time to ask questions to project representatives. Questions that were not answered during the February 2 meeting due to the need to discuss the topic with Board members or the DWR, were noted to be rediscussed for the February 3 meeting. Public comments were taken at the end of the meeting. Two members of the public made comments.

Some concerns were raised at the February 2 meeting on four projects in particular. Concerns for the AMI project proposed by BWD included questions about the water savings and the effects on ratepayers, as well as opportunities to obtain other grant funding sources, such as from the Bureau of Reclamation. The Biological Restoration of Fallowed Lands project proposed by the BSWM raised concerns about accessing land to conduct studies, and the agreement, willingness, and capability of the BSWM to continue the project beyond the life of the grant. Another BSWM-proposed project, the Monitoring, Reporting, and GMP Update, raised concerns about pumper assessment fees being offset and the reimbursement eligibility of BSWM's Board meetings. Land access was also a concern for the Tubb Canyon GDE Identification, Assessment, and Monitoring project, in addition to consideration for their ability to provide upfront costs for the grant.

To address the concerns from the February 2 meeting, the representatives and/or PRC members stated the following:

- The BSWD described how water savings from the AMI project would stem from the unrecognized leaks that go uncaptured without AMI. A consultant for the BSWD also stated that the BSWD has a three-tier rate structure, and the lowest tier is for essential use. In addition, ratepayers will have access in real-time to their water usage data, which gives ratepayers the proactive ability to correct their household overwater usage. The only optional cost of the program is automated valve shut off. The BSWD has previously sought other funding sources, such as from the Bureau of Reclamation, but did not receive any funds.
- The BSWM stated that they are assuming they will get access to land and that the question of whether BSWM agrees to continue the project post the grant agreement will be raised to the BSWM Board.
- The BSWM stated that pumper assessment fees would be reduced from the Monitoring, Reporting, and GMP Update project, and that they would further discuss Board meeting reimbursement eligibility with the DWR. (Note: The BSWM met with the DWR after the PRC meeting on February 2 and revised their budget based on DWR answers to project task eligibility.)
- The TCDC stated that there are currently no land access agreements to conduct the project, but they have worked with State Parks, the landowner agency that would be contacted, over the past 10 years. The TCDC is working with the BSWD and others to secure funding prior to reimbursements.

PRC members also had concerns related to project that were submitted and discussed at the February 2 meeting but not included in the project list. Specifically, for the GDE Monitoring Program proposed by the BSWM, concerns were raised about the techniques that would be used to conduct the monitoring, the reasons why the BSWM was not using existing wells but rather constructing new ones, and the high costs for some of the project tasks. It was

also noted that there was association of some of the project tasks with other proposed projects. The BSWM responded that there was no presumption of what techniques could be used for the project, existing wells could not be used for this project because the wells need to be constructed in a precise matter and in the appropriate location, and the budget was developed under a very tight schedule. Concerns about the Water Supply Augmentation project proposed by SDFB and AAWARE were related to the fact that this concept been extensively studied before and already been determined that the benefits of a water supply augmentation project have never outweighed the costs. Additional concerns included the relationship between this project and the other project proposed by SDFB/AAWARE, as well as the adverse effects on ratepayers, which is why the BWD does not support the project. The SDFB/AAWARE representative responded that there are data gaps that are still missing from prior studies, and the purpose of this study is to come up with new alternatives for groundwater recharge. In addition, the project representative stated that the project indirectly helps the basin reach groundwater sustainability. SDFB/AAWARE further stated that the difference between two of the projects they submitted was that one was more of a generic study and the other was a specific study.

During the February 3 meeting, the facilitator reviewed the agenda, provided updates to project submissions announced after the February 2 meeting, and updates from the BWD and BSWM meeting with DWR and the Board meetings that took place on February 2. The SDFB/AAWARE Groundwater Augmentation Import, Borrego Springs Unified School District Education, BVEF Air Quality Monitoring, Borrego Valley Stewardship Council Resiliency Strategy, and De Anza Water Conservation Plan projects were discussed. As in the February 2nd meeting, all PRC members were given adequate time to ask questions to project representatives. De Anza Country Club removed a task from their proposal and reduced their requested grant funds accordingly. One PRC member withdrew one of their project submissions and remained as a PRC member, as they represented another project. Two projects that were discussed during the February 2nd meeting were revisited, and all attendees were given updates on the changes. The BSWM Monitoring, Reporting, and GMP Update had budget revisions, and the TCDC GDE Identification, Assessment, and Monitoring announced that a collaboration with the Watermaster was not approved by the Watermaster Board. Only one comment from the public was made.

Additional concerns were brought up in the February 3 meeting. The Borrego Springs Unified School District was asked about the amount of water careers that would result from their proposed Education project. Concerns about the Air Quality Monitoring project proposed by BVEF included the ability to access land, BVEF's capability to continue the project beyond the life of the grant, and the quality of the existing air quality stations. Concerns about Borrego Valley Stewardship Council's Resiliency Strategy project were about the core deliverable and the connection to the grant. The De Anza Water Conservation Plan project proposed by the De Anza Country Club solicited questions about the amount of water savings, the type of institution that benefits from the proposed water savings, and the ability to carry over and sell the water savings. Additional questions were about the ability and willingness of De Anza Country Club to sell their water rights to the BWD and to obtain a land easement to ensure perpetuity in water conservation. The Monitoring, Reporting, and GMP Update Changes project concern about the pumper fees was raised again, in addition to a new question to address if a PRC member's company would benefit from the grant. The BSWM stated that the pumper fees could be reduced from this grant, and that the PRC member's company would not benefit from the grant.

To address the concerns list above from the February 3 meeting, the representatives and/or PRC members stated the following:

- A Borrego Springs Unified School District representative stated that career paths would be related to water, so there is a possibility that Borrego residents could be trained to do other work in the environmental sector.
- The BVEF does not have agreements to access lands to conduct the project, and some of the land access agreements would be with State Parks. The BVEF also confirmed that the University of California, Irvine is willing to take on the management and upkeep of the air quality monitoring devices past the life of the grant, and that the current air monitoring stations have shown exceedance levels in air quality. They also stated that the addressed data gap would be the eastern side of the valley.
- The Borrego Valley Stewardship Council representative stated that the core deliverable of the Resiliency Strategy project was to design a community resiliency strategy. The connection to the grant is that systems do not work in silo, so the project is somewhat broad to include all systems, and it directly speaks to groundwater education.
- The representative from De Anza Country Club stated that the Country Club wanted to explore the possibility of an easement with the Watermaster because the goal is to conserve water. The other important aspect of the project is to support the local economy and retain jobs. It was also stated that the Country Club is willing to work on any aspect of the project to make it feasible and is willing to present the idea of the land easement to the De Anza Country Club Board. A representative of the BSWM said that the Country Club has the ability to sell their water rights to the BSWD under the judgement, but due to the economics, the BSWM stated that it was going to be tough for the Country Club to sell their water rights and still be in operation.

The Evaluation of Groundwater Augmentation Import project proposed by the SDFB/AAWARE was one project that was submitted and discussed in the February 3 meeting but was not included in the spending plan. PRC members had concerns raised for this project due to the GMP stating that the Borrego Springs Subbasin would not do an augmentation importation project. However, one PRC member stated that the judgement does include support for water importation. Additional concerns included affordability of the treatment of water, and the overall costs of the project. SDFB/AAWARE responded by stating that page 34 of the judgement did state water importation to the basin and that the physical solution is not only the GMP, but also consists of the judgement. SDFB/AAWARE also went over costs and made a comparison of the estimated price of water from the proposed project related to other water prices, and that some of the other projects proposed by the PRC did not provide conservation at a higher rate than the Evaluation of Groundwater Augmentation Import project.

After all projects were discussed, PRC members reviewed their preliminary scores during the February 3 meeting. Any project score changes from PRC members were submitted via email. Preliminary score changes from individual project members were based on the discussions that had taken place over the 2-day meeting period. A representative from the BWD updated the score cards during the meeting, and all attendees were given the ability to see the changes made in real-time via Zoom screen share.

Projects whose average score changed from the preliminary average scores were the following:

(a) Project Title	(b) Interested Party	(c) Preliminary Average Score	(d) Average Score Agreed Upon PRC During Meetings	(e) Change from (c) to (d)
Advanced Metering Infrastructure	BWD	25.6	25.5	-0.1
Solar Project	BWD	24.7	23.9	-0.8
WWTP Monitoring Wells	BWD	24.7	23.2	-1.5
Education Project	BSUSD	21.6	22.9	+1.3
Resiliency Project	BVSC	19	18.7	-0.3
Biological Restoration of Fallowed Lands	BSWM	19.5	18.3	-1.2
Monitoring, Reporting, and GMP Update	BSWM	20.7	17.6	-3.1
De Anza Water Conservation Plan	DADC	18.1	17.4	-0.7
Air Quality Monitoring	BVEF	17.5	17.1	-0.4
GDE Identification, Assessment, and Monitoring	TCDC	16.2	16.1	-0.1

Notes: PRC = Project Review Committee; BWD = Borrego Water District; WWTP = Wastewater Treatment Plant; BSUSD = Borrego Springs Unified School District; BVSC = Borrego Valley Stewardship Council; BSWM = Borrego Springs Watermaster; GMP = Groundwater Management Plan; DADC = De Anza Desert County Club; BVEF = Borrego Valley Endowment Fund; GDE = Groundwater Dependent Ecosystem; TCDC = Tubb Canyon Desert Conservancy

After scores were updated, any questions about re-submitted score cards were asked to individual PRC members. All PRC members had the opportunity to confirm their score cards for all projects via screen-share after the clarification questions were answered. Projects were ranked in order of project scores, highest to lowest. For Question 7 and 8 on the scoring criteria, two projects (BVEF Air Quality Monitoring and BWD Solar) scored zero for one question (6 and 7) because PRC members felt that the project did not address the question. No PRC members voted to change the ranking of the projects. PRC members voted to submit 10 projects for inclusion in the \$10,903,600 spending plan for BWD Board member approval to submit to the DWR. This amount does not include grant administration costs requested by the BWD.

After review of the spending plan agreed upon by the PRC members, one addition and two revisions were made to the spending plan. The AMI project proposed by the BWD had a budget error. The total of the project is \$1,300,000 not \$1,275,000. The GDE Identification, Assessment, and Monitoring project revised their budget and decreased it from \$1,037,000 to \$1,036,743. Grant administration costs totaled \$250,000. With the revisions and grant administration cost, the final requested grant amount totals \$11,178,343. With local cost shares, the total spending plan for 10 projects is \$11,458,351— this does not include overall grant administration costs of \$250,000.

Project schedules were also revised. Due to the need to allocate time for grant administration tasks in 2025, any project who listed a project task end date as 06/30/2025 was changed to 03/30/2025. Individual PRC members were notified via email of this change.

A first draft of this memo was provided to the BWD Board on February 4, 2022. The Board was given time after the meeting to provide any comments to the draft. Four members of the Board provided feedback. Two Board members believed the De Anza Country Club Water Conservation project benefits description was not accurate. The members stated that the individual pumper did save water, but it does not reduce the total withdrawals from the basin, and the public benefit is little for the community as a whole. Another Board member had a comment on the Biological Restoration of Fallowed Lands project proposed by the BSWM. The Board member felt that the project management category was overbid for some tasks, and the hours delegated to some tasks, such the review of existing data, was high due to the amount of data available. The last comment was from a Board member who had multiple questions on the budget of the Monitoring, Reporting, and GMP project proposed by BSWM. The Board member questioned the cost difference of certain tasks when comparing the revised project budget to the “Five-Year Projection of Borrego Springs Watermaster Operating Budget: Water Years 2022 through 2026” and made a comment on how the sum of the individual tasks did not sum up to the total project cost listed.

Documents and attachments for the SGMA Grant Program – Round 1 are as follows:

- the spending plan (**BorregoSpringsSubbasin_BorregoWaterDistrict_SpendingPlan**),
- this memo/scoring criteria (**AttA_BorregoWaterDistrict_ScoringCriteria**),
- adopted resolution (**AttB_BorregoWaterDistrict_Resolution**),
- eligibility self-certification form (**AttC_BorregoWaterDistrict_EligibilityChecklistForm**), and
- additional backup (**AttD_BorregoWaterDistrict_AdditionalBackup**).

As stated, preliminary scores were assigned prior to the PRC meetings on February 2 and 3. The reviewed scores are the scores that can be found in the spending plan and individual project scorecards. The project descriptions that follow this memo are a high-level summary of what the interested parties prepared and submitted in their project submittal information forms. Dudek only extracted information and did not generate any original content in the project descriptions. If the DWR does request these descriptions, Dudek is prepared to send original descriptions prepared by the project representatives/interested parties.

Spending Plan Project Description Summaries

Borrego Water District – Advanced Meter Infrastructure

This project will replace all of Borrego Water District's (BWD) manual water meters with an Advanced Metering Infrastructure system and will evaluate the usefulness of remotely controlled automatic valves as add-ons to the system. The benefits of the project include reduction in the basin pumping through early recognition and correction of major and minor water leaks for residential and commercial customers, improvement in BWD water system loss as a result of improved metering accuracy, and water conservation through education and display of real time data to customers.

Borrego Water District – Solar Project

The project will design, permit, construct, and monitor production of a series of distributed photovoltaic systems at six well sites. BWD operates nine potable production wells to deliver water to its customers and is currently 100% dependent upon San Diego Gas & Electric to provide the required electricity for pumping with annual expenses of approximately \$350,000 per year. The benefit of this project includes direct and immediate water rate relief for BWD customers and insulation from future rate hikes and greenhouse gas reduction.

Borrego Water District – Wastewater Treatment Plant Monitoring Wells

The project will study the fate and transport of nitrogen and total dissolved solids originating from the discharge of effluent, document existing spare capacity of the Rams Hills Wastewater Treatment Facility, and evaluate potential modifications to the treatment process. The facility is a 250,000 gallons-per-day extended aeration (oxidation ditch) plant with evaporation/percolation ponds for disposal. The benefits of this project include protection and potentially enhancement of water quality through future upgrades to the wastewater treatment facility processes, if necessary.

Borrego Springs Unified School District – Education Project

This project will create a Career Technical Education (CTE) Pathway in Energy, Environment, and Utilities for Borrego Springs Middle and High Schools. Currently there is little understanding among students and their families about Borrego Springs's water sustainability challenges and the required ramp down of water usage over the next 18 years. The benefits of this project include community-wide enhanced understanding of Borrego Springs's over-drafted water basin, conservation of water due to collective knowledge and appreciation of our legal requirement to pump less water, reaching sustainable water levels over time with community-wide awareness, local students and residents become part of the solution to the sustainable groundwater management through their pursuit of less-water-intensive careers, creation of an economically viable and sustainable community, and tourists being made aware of Borrego Springs's sustainable groundwater management requirements.

Borrego Valley Stewardship Council – Resiliency Strategy

This project will convene groundwater stakeholders to develop plans, programs, and project to improve watershed health. It will establish a network of partners across the basin for community visioning and integrated planning, support education and engagement with the Community Plan Updated and Watermaster Board implementation of the groundwater Settlement Agreement and Groundwater Management Plan, and ensure natural resources and ecological

priorities are aligned and protected across the region's primary planning documents. The benefits of this project include educating and engaging vulnerable and marginalized community members in Borrego Springs and empowering them to develop solutions for adapting to climate impacts, including constrained water resources, warming temperatures, air quality deterioration, and indirect effects on public health, the economy, and the environment.

Borrego Springs Watermaster – Biological Restoration of Fallowed Lands

This project will characterize historical and current conditions of lands, explore the feasibility of various biological restoration/rehabilitation techniques, and develop guidance for future biological restoration projects on current and future fallowed lands within the Subbasin. Fallowing of agricultural lands will be a primary tool to reduce groundwater demands, but there are several adverse impacts that could be associated with fallowing, including airborne emissions through wind-blown dust, the introduction or spreading of invasive plant species, and changes to the landscape that could adversely affect visual quality. The benefits of this project include the development of guidance criteria for the use of biological restoration as a technique to mitigate the potential adverse impacts associated with fallowing of lands.

Borrego Springs Watermaster – Monitoring, Reporting, and Groundwater Management Plan Update

This project will provide a comprehensive monitoring, analysis, data management, and reporting program that will ensure the effective implementation of the pumping ramp down, including filling data gaps identified in the Judgement and Groundwater Management Plan, and performing the required redetermination of the Sustainable Yield and Groundwater Management Plan update due in 2025. The benefits of the project are the development of robust data sets needed to assess if the key elements of the Physical Solution are achieving the desired results, including reductions in pumping, decreased rate of water level declines, water quality consistent with drinking water regulations, and refined estimation of water budget components.

De Anza Desert Country Club – De Anza Water Conservation Plan

This project will reduce De Anza Desert Country Club's (a non-privately owned, 501C (7) non-profit organization) annual water consumption and expedite their commitment to reduce pumping from the critically over-drafted basin through a two-pronged approach: (1) turf reduction and conversion to low-water-consumptive indigenous landscaping and (2) overhaul of the irrigation system for efficiency and control. The benefits of this project include reduction of water consumptive turf area and fast forwarding the organization's goal by over 9 years via completion of the turf reduction project.

Borrego Valley Endowment Fund – Air Quality Monitoring

This project will provide two datasets to the Borrego Watermaster, water management planners, and the affected citizens of the region that fill in gaps in planning for and assessing the consequences of sustainable groundwater management. The first data will be generated by augmenting Borrego's existing hydroclimate monitoring system with two new stations in the eastern subbasin that fill the spatial gaps of the current system. The second data set focuses exclusively on the air quality impacts of fallowing agricultural lands. The benefits of this project enhancing the understanding of the water economy of the subbasin and enabling the essential management action to proceed in a manner consistent with the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act goal of retaining a healthy, thriving community throughout the ramp down process.

Tubb Canyon Desert Conservancy – Groundwater Dependent Ecosystem (GDE) Identification, Assessment, and Monitoring

The project will determine if the potential groundwater dependence of ecosystems that were once indisputably groundwater dependent, but at the present time may no longer be accessing groundwater due to declines in the water table over the past several decades, are, in fact, groundwater dependent. It will also determine if the groundwater that supports this GDE is impacted by changes in the groundwater level in the Borrego Subbasin. The benefit of the project include an enhanced understanding of the Borrego Subbasin, and potentially, will result in revisions to the Groundwater Management Plan to protect the environment and beneficial users of groundwater pursuant to the requirements of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act. Other benefits include the generation of data and information that could be useful to the community and the Watermaster of other basin management initiatives, including the periodic Redetermination of the Sustainable Yield, groundwater-level and groundwater-quality monitoring programs, annual reporting to DWR, and other benefits.

Note – Alternative Project Organization: Tubb Canyon Desert Conservancy (TCDC) is open to this project being led by the Borrego Water District, as suggested by BWD counsel Steve Anderson during the February 8, 2022, Tuesday BWD Board meeting. In that case, organization, hiring, and retention of scientists and contractors would be up to the BWD. Budget amounts for staff time would likely vary. Nevertheless, it would be difficult for the BWD to find someone “off the street” who combines the requisite scientific/technical expertise with knowledge of the Borrego landscape, both literally and figuratively, that TCDC possesses. The TCDC has already designed the project in consultation with the required subject matter experts. The TCDC looks forward to working out an agreeable relationship with the BWD that can make this important project successful.

Attachment A

PRC Scoring Sheets - Summarized
(Averaged Scores)

Project Review Committee (PRC) Member	Organization
Tammy Baker	Borrego Water District (BWD)
Dianne Johnson	Borrego Water District (BWD)
Jim Bennett	Borrego Springs WaterMaster (BSWM)
Mike Seley	Borrego Springs WaterMaster (BSWM)
Shannon Smith	Borrego Springs WaterMaster (BSWM)
Mark Stevens	Borrego Springs Unified School District (BSUSD)
David Garmon	Borrego Valley Endowment Fund (BVEF)
Atley Keller	Borrego Valley Stewardship Council (BVSC)
Ramien Shalizi	De Anza Country Club (DACC)
Robert Staehle	Tubb Canyon Desert Conservancy (TCDC)