

List of Attachments

- Attachment A: Community Advisory Commission Members
- Attachment B: Community Advisory Commission Work Plan
- Attachment C: Outreach Efforts and Presentations made to Commission
- Attachment D: Commission's Key Issues for EIR/EIS Scoping
- Attachment E: CIC Research, Inc. Economic Analysis Report
- Attachment F: CIC Research, Inc. Chapter on Environmental Justice
(appendix A of Economist Analysis Report)
- Attachment G: Farm Bureau Conservation Plan and Financial Analysis
- Attachment H: Bratton Plan and Financial Analysis
- Attachment I: Minority Report by Ike Adams

Attachment A

**Imperial Irrigation District's
Community Advisory Commission Members**

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------|
| Ike Adams * | Dick Kershaw * |
| John Anderson * | Heidi Kuhn * |
| Bill Condit * | Vincent Long |
| Don Cox | Jose Lopez * |
| Jim Duggins * | Dilda McFadden |
| Larry Gilbert | Frank Miranda * |
| Shorty Hickingbottom * | Gil Perez * |
| Hank Kuiper | Earl Roberts * |
| Steve Hogan | Luis Zendejas * |

*** Members since its inception**

ATTACHMENT B

Community Advisory Commission Work Plan

I. Broad Mission

The broad mission of the CAC, as stated in IID board resolution 17-98 is to

- (1) Assess possible community benefits and impacts of the IID's Water Conservation Plan
- (2) Recommend possible community impact mitigation measures
- (3) Memorialize its work for consideration in the EIR/EIS process.

II. Areas of work

In meeting the Board's goals for the CAC, its work falls into two separate and distinct areas:

(1) Development of a parallel, but objective, completely independent and proactive process that will address community concerns regarding a water transfer with the San Diego County Water Authority.

- (A) The CAC will develop an outreach program to the community to solicit input regarding benefits and concerns about the water transfer and will insure they are addressed by the IID Board as necessary. Means to develop this information can include:
 - Presentations to community-based organizations, service clubs, school organizations, city councils, chambers of commerce and other groups as identified by the CAC.
 - Documenting opinions from various constituencies
- (B) The CAC will develop comments and positions on socio-economic benefits or impacts of the transfer that may or may not be addressed by the EIR/EIS process. This can include:
 - Validation of existing studies, such as the economic impact report developed by Dombush;
 - Development of other economic models with the assistance of independent experts.
- (C) The CAC will act as a medium through which the broader community becomes more familiar with the issues surrounding the water transfer and the Valley's water rights. The CAC can do this through:
 - Presentations at its public meetings
 - Community forums in all Valley communities.

(2) Work within the legal constraints of the EIR-EIS

- (A) The CAC, in coordination with IID staff, will meet regularly with the CH2M Hill consultant according to the work plan to insure that the socio-economic concerns of the broader community are being addressed in the EIR/EIS process.
- (B) The CAC will work with the IID and CH2M Hill on the public scoping process.

III. Final products

- (1) **The CAC will quantify and document community impacts and benefits and make recommendations regarding mitigation alternatives.** As part of this, the CAC will address whether there should be a recommendation to the board that some money from the transfer should go to the broader community.
- (2) **The work of the CAC will be considered for inclusion in the final EIR-EIS documents.**
- (3) **A separate report will be prepared by the CAC that contains both majority and minority findings of the CAC. It will contain:**
 - Concerns or comments regarding the actual EIR-EIS report
 - Other issues that may or may not be included in the EIR/EIS but are considered important for the board to incorporate in its deliberations regarding the water transfer.

Attachment C

Outreach and Presentations to CAC

In accomplishing its Work Plan (Attachment B) the CAC made a number of public outreach efforts:

January 1999: Letter sent to all organizations that were involved in the CAC process, seeking their concerns and recommendations regarding the water transfer. Two responses were received: from the City of El Centro and the El Centro Chamber of Commerce.

March 16, 1999: IID legal counsel expresses concern that CAC's outreach work may be confused with the legal scoping process. They recommend separate letterheads to lessen potential for this confusion. That recommendation is accepted.

March 23, 1999: When representatives from Palo Verde decline to appear before CAC to discuss MWD following experiment there, CAC members undertake their own investigation in a visit to Palo Verde. Those findings are reported back to the committee.

Sept. 24, 1999: CAC sends letter to all organizations involved in CAC process inviting representatives to attend its Oct. 5, 1999 meeting to learn about the scoping process. The objective is to build interest in the official scoping hearings set for Oct. 12, 13, & 14 1999.

Oct. 19, 2000: CAC holds its own "scoping meeting" to develop its input to the final CH2M Hill Report. Public invited to participate.

Nov. 9, 1999: Subcommittees established to solicit input from Agriculture, Community Based Organizations, Ag related businesses, Cities/County, Chambers and other businesses.

Dec. 7, 1999: Business subcommittee holds discussion session and elicits information from several Valley business entities regarding transfer.

Jan. 28, 2000: Community Based Organizations Subcommittee meets with non-profits to discuss mitigation issues.

Feb. 9, 2000: Survey mailed to Ag related businesses seeking information on how the transfer will impact them.

April 11, 2000: CAC hosts CH2M Hill economist in presentation on economic aspects of EIR/EIS. Ads placed for public participation.

July 25, 2000: CAC hosts U.S. Filter in presentation of its proposals regarding transfer. Ads taken out to get public participation

March 27, 2002: CAC hosts major water forum in cooperation with a number of community-based organizations for the purpose of educating the public on the impending transfer and its ramifications. Intent was to foster interest in April 3, 2002 public hearing on the EIR in El Centro.

A Partial List of Presentations to CAC:

Oct. 6, 1998: Presentation on Colorado River Issues by John Carter and David Osias.
Oct. 13, 1998: Presentation on Colorado River issues as seen by Colorado and Arizona. Presenters: Jim Lockhead, special consultant to Colorado Governor and Rita Pearson, Director of Arizona Water Resources.
Oct. 20, 1998: Presentation by IID Water Conservation Advisory Board
Oct. 27, 1998: Presentation by IID legal counsel on transfer agreement
Nov. 3, 1998: Presentation on Valley Ag Economics by Farm Bureau reps
Nov. 10, 1998: Presentation by Tom Topuzes on Valley economy
Nov. 17, 1998: Presentation by IID legal counsel on costs of transfer
Dec. 1, 1998: Presentation by EDD on employment issues in Valley
Dec. 8, 1998: Presentation on water conservation alternatives by IID staff
Dec. 15, 1998: Presentation by CH2M Hill on EIR/EIS process
Jan. 19, 1999: Presentation by Jim Merchant on Dornbush Study
May 18, 1999: Presentation by Bill Jacoby, San Diego County Water Authority on San Diego's water needs.
June 15, 1999: Presentation by IID staff on on-farm guidelines
Nov. 30, 1999: Presentation by Tom Kirk, Executive Director of Salton Sea Authority, on Salton Sea Restoration issues
July 25, 2000: Presentation by Ed McGrew on US Filter proposals re transfer
Sept. 12, 2000: Presentation by Andy Horne & Tom Veysey on Salton Sea issues
Oct. 30, 2001: Presentation by Robert Johnson of the Bureau of Reclamation and Tom Kirk of the Salton Sea Authority regarding economic implications of the transfer and impacts/choices facing the Salton Sea
March 27, 2002: Water Issues Forum featuring key representatives from the Bureau of Reclamation, Planning and Conservation League, Defenders of Wildlife, San Diego County Water Authority, IID, Valley businesses and agriculture.

CAC'S KEY ISSUES ON EIR/EIS

Economic Development/Employment Issues

L14-25

1) Loss of Jobs

Jobs could be lost if land is taken out of production or if farmers go to less labor-intensive crops. This could impact farm workers as well as suppliers and the general community.

L14-26

2) Valley's reputation will be hurt

The Valley's reputation could be hurt if people elsewhere in the nation perceive the Valley "sold out" its water rights. This occurred in the Owens Valley.

L14-27

3) Loss of water will hurt future development of NAFTA-related industry in the border area.

Major firms that are looking at moving into Mexicali and into this region of the U.S. are attracted by an abundant water supply as well as other factors.

L14-28

4) Price of Water

If there is a reduction in water availability, the price will be higher.

L14-29

5) There will be changes in the nature of jobs available in the Valley.

Response to Comment L14-25

The Socioeconomics section in the Draft EIR/EIS (Section 3.14) reports the total jobs that are anticipated to be lost within the Imperial County economy as a result of fallowing. The job-loss estimates include job losses in farm support industries and the Imperial County economy in general.

Response to Comment L14-26

Without a specific reference to a part of the Draft EIR/EIS, this comment is too general to respond to. Comment noted.

Response to Comment L14-27

The second implementation scenario for the Proposed Project (QSA Implementation) includes the more restrictive limit on IID's future diversions of Colorado River water on IID's Priority 3 diversions. Under the maximum transfers provided for under the QSA, IID would retain the ability to divert in excess of 2.6 MAFY of Colorado River water for agricultural, industrial, and domestic use within the IID water service area. In addition, at the end of the initial 45-year term, the IID/SDCWA Transfer Agreement potentially allows IID to reclaim up to 34 KAFY of transfer water for M&I use within the Imperial Valley. This amount is twice the expected growth in M&I use within the IID water service area over the next 45 years. Therefore, the Proposed Project and Alternatives described in the Draft EIR/EIS can be implemented without compromising the Imperial Valley's urban water supply. IID will continue to make water deliveries reasonably required for municipal and industrial beneficial uses, including current use and expected growth in these sectors.

Response to Comment L14-28

Please refer to the response given for Comment L14-27.

Response to Comment L14-29

Labor force training or retraining utilizing the resources of Imperial Valley College and San Diego State University could be included as part of Project implementation. As described in the Draft EIR/EIS,

Response to Comment L14-29 (continued)

depending on the eventual implementation of the water conservation program, there could either be beneficial or adverse impacts to the regional economy. If water is conserved using on-farm and water delivery system improvements, it is anticipated that there would be beneficial effects to regional employment; therefore, there would not be any adverse effects to mitigate. If fallowing is used to conserve all or a portion of the water to be transferred, there would be adverse effects to the regional economy and farm workers as identified in the Draft EIR/EIS.

The IID Board will consider whether to implement socioeconomic mitigation measures when it considers whether to approve the Proposed Project or an alternative to the Proposed Project.

As we move from labor-intensive work to a more mechanized and white-collar economy, training issues at IVC and SDSU need to be addressed to ensure we have a qualified work force.

L14-29

6) **There will be positive impacts to the economy with the money coming into the Valley as a result of the transfer.**

L14-30

How will it be distributed? Who will say where it will go? It is important that this money stays in the Valley economy.

Response to Comment L14-30

The distribution of the transfer revenues is a decision that will be made by the IID Board when the conservation program is developed. A set of modeling assumptions as outlined in Appendix G of the Draft EIR/EIS were used to estimate the potential range of socioeconomic impacts.

Response to Comment L14-31

Please refer to the response given for Comment L14-27.

Response to Comment L14-32

Please refer to the response given for Comment L14-27.

Business Issues

1) **Reserve water for business expansion and attraction.**

L14-31

Current figures state only 2% of the IID water is used by cities. Need to take into consideration the loss of water and price of water to the cities and the impact on expansion of incorporated and unincorporated communities.

2) **How will the water transfer effect the possibilities of future expansion of the IID service area to unincorporated communities such as Ocotillo and those along the shores of Salton Sea.**

L14-32

Salton Sea communities currently receive water from CVWD, but not

ATTACHMENT D

enough. They would like to be included in our service area.

L14-32

3) What are the Water

Conservation Effects on:

- 1) Land Values
- 2) Cropping patterns/crop quality
- 3) I.V.'s market position in state/world ag markets
- 4) Price of water
- 5) Use of farm inputs/labor

If there is not enough money for true conservation, people will choose lower value crops even though they are not asking for those crops.

L14-33

4) Cropping patterns is a big issue that needs to be discussed.

Crop quality (if they put less water on alfalfa, for example) will affect our yields as a county. Making cropping decisions is part of state and global market. If the price of water goes up, it would affect farming.

L14-34

Response to Comment L14-33

For effects of the Proposed Project on land values, refer to the Master Response on *Socioeconomics—Property Values and Fiscal Impact Estimates* in this Final EIR/EIS.

Regarding the effects of the Proposed Project on cropping patters/crop quality, the agricultural resources analysis (Section 3.5) and the socioeconomic analysis (Section 3.14) in the Draft EIR/EIS assume that, while on-farm irrigation efficiency will be improved and tailwater reduced, farm managers will continue to fully irrigate all crops that are planted and that sufficient water will be applied to meet leaching requirements. Therefore, there will not be any impact on the quality or per-acre yield of crops that are grown. Also, see response to Comment L14-27.

Regarding the effects of the Proposed Project on the Imperial Valley's position in state/world agricultural markets, no impacts to the quality or yield of crops grown are expected. Therefore, the Proposed Project is not anticipated to affect the position of Imperial Valley farmers relative to state and world markets.

Regarding the effects of the Proposed Project on the price of water, no changes in water prices are anticipated as a result of the Proposed Project.

Regarding the effects of the Proposed Project on use of farm inputs/labor, the socioeconomic analysis in the Draft EIR/EIS assesses the adverse impacts that could occur with implementation of fallowing as a conservation measure. Also, IID will assess the merits of landowners' proposed method of conservation prior to enrollment in the water conservation program. Also, refer to the Master Response on *Socioeconomics—Crop Type Assumptions for Socioeconomic Analysis of Fallowing* in Section 3 of this Final EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment L14-34

See response to Comment L14-33.