



STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

AGENDA

Wednesday, January 12, 2022

8:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.

Call-In Information Provided Below

NOTICE: Coronavirus COVID-19

See Attached Notice Regarding COVID-19

- I. **Call to Order/Roll Call** (*Please remember to keep your phone line muted and unmute when announcing yourself for attendance or speaking)
- II. **Scheduled Items – *Presentation Materials to be Posted on ESJGroundwater.org and Emailed Prior to the Meeting.***
 - A. **Discussion/Action Items**
 1. Approval of the December 8, 2021 Meeting Minutes ([Attachment 1 - Page 4](#))
 2. Discussion and Possible Action to Adopt Resolution R-22-XX Determining to Conduct Meetings Using Teleconferencing Pursuant to Government Code 54953 as Amended by AB 361 ([Attachment 2 - Page 9](#))
 3. DWR GSP Comments and Next Steps ([Attachment 3 - Page 12](#))
 4. DWR Proposal for SGMA Implementation Grant Funds
 - a. Spending Plan Overview ([Attachment 4 - Page 16](#))
 - b. GSA Support Needs
 - c. GWA Resolution ([Attachment 5 - Page 23](#))
 5. Model Updates and GSA Water Budgets: TAC Activities and Next Steps
 6. Water Accounting Framework Discussion, Status and Next Steps
- III. **Staff Reports**
 1. DWR ([Attachment 6 - Page 25](#))
 2. Other Items
- IV. **Public Comment (non-agenized items)**
- V. **Director Comments**

EASTERN SAN JOAQUIN GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY

Steering Committee Meeting

AGENDA

(Continued)

VI. Future Agenda Items

VII. Adjournment

Next Scheduled Meeting

Wednesday, February 9, 2022

8:30 am to 10:00 am

Location TBD

EASTERN SAN JOAQUIN GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY

Steering Committee Meeting

AGENDA

(Continued)

NOTICE: Coronavirus COVID-19

Important Notice Regarding COVID 19 and Closure of Board Chambers to the Public During Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority Steering Committee Meeting

In accordance with the Ralph M. Brown Act (Cal. Gov. Code 54950 *et seq.*), as amended by Assembly Bill 361 (2021), the Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority Steering Committee Members and staff will be participating in this meeting via teleconference. In the interest of maintaining appropriate social distancing, members of the public may participate in the meeting by teleconference.

In order to minimize the spread of the COVID 19 virus, the following options are available to members of the public to listen to these meetings and provide comments to the Committee Members before and during the meeting:

1. You are strongly encouraged to listen to the Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority Steering Committee meetings by attending the teleconference:

Microsoft Teams meeting

Join on your computer or mobile app

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

Or call in (audio only)

[+1 209-645-4071,,846250395#](#) United States, Stockton

Phone Conference ID: 846 250 395#

[Find a local number](#) | [Reset PIN](#)

[Learn More](#) | [Meeting options](#)

Once connected, we request you kindly mute your phone.

2. If you wish to make a comment on a specific agenda item, please submit your comment via email by 5:00 p.m. on the Tuesday prior to the meeting. Please submit your comment to the Secretary of the Board at ksmith@sjgov.org. Your comment will be shared with the Board members and placed into the record at the meeting. Every effort will be made to read comments received during the meeting into the record but some comments may not be read due to time limitations. Comments received after an agenda item will be made part of the record if received prior to the end of the meeting.

Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority Steering Committee Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, December 8, 2021

Meeting called to order: at 8:35 a.m.

The Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority (GWA) Steering Committee meeting was conducted via teleconference using Microsoft Teams. Chairman Charles Winn called the meeting to order. Reminders were provided to the attendees regarding meeting procedures.

Roll Call taken:

Roll call taken of members only.

In attendance were Chairman Winn; Directors Mike Henry; Robert Holmes and Alternate Directors Walter Ward; Andrew Watkins; Mel Lytle

Others in attendance were logged via their sign into Microsoft Teams.

Discussion / Action Items:

1. Approval of the November 10, 2021 Meeting Minutes

No amendments to the minutes.

Motion: Director Robert Holmes

2nd: Director Mike Henry

Chairman Winn asked for any Opposed or Abstains. With none provided, the minutes were approved unanimously.

2. Discussion and Possible Action to Adopt Resolution R-21-XX Determining to Conduct Meetings Using Teleconferencing Pursuant to Government Code 54953 as Amended by AB 361

Mr. Matt Zidar (San Joaquin County) with Mr. Rod Attebery (GWA Counsel) reviewed the process requirements. The Committee members were in agreement.

Chairman Winn further noted that there has been a lot of discussion amongst the Supervisors in the State, regarding possible plans for renewing every 30-days until the Order is adjusted. Mr. Fritz Buchman of San Joaquin County noted that the 30-day renewal requirement will be an issue if the GWA Board meets quarterly but may become a non-issue if a decision is made to meet monthly. He further noted that discussion of meeting frequency is an item of discussion at today's Board meeting. Mr. Zidar added that Mr. Rod Attebery-GWA Counsel, would be on the Board Meeting and could further explain.

3. State of California Department of Water Resources (DWR) Comments on the Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP)

Mr. Zidar reviewed the un-official DWR comments on the GSP received so far, noting that the official comments would be coming in January and would require response within 180 days from receipt and

that no GSP approval would be provided until comments are addressed. Mr. Zidar explained the DWR Consultation Process and noted that an initial informal meeting had occurred to discuss the process requirements. Mr. Zidar added that legal review of the comments is requested, and that County Counsel Kirin Virk would be coordinating with other counsel within the Basin to discuss and start a work group. Mr. Zidar added that Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) coordination is needed to form work groups and to finalize the response to DWR.

Director Mike Henry questioned the two areas identified in the DWR comments and if there was indication from DWR that other areas could be included in official comments. Mr. Zidar advised that while DWR did not specify any other areas, they do reserve the right to add comments to the official comments provided.

Chairman Winn questioned if the consultation process would continue after official comments received by January 29, 2022 and if it was known if other Basins were getting similar criticism on their GSPs. Mr. Zidar advised that consultation would continue and that there is not currently a matrix on comments throughout Basins but is something he would like the consultants to work on. It was noted that the common comments to multiple Basins included water quality, drinking water and subsidence. Chairman Winn questioned if we have an idea of GSP language used on those GSPs with approved items. Mr. Zidar advised that is unknown, but again something the consultant would research and coordinate.

Chairman Winn added that the GWA is responsible for outcome and sustainability and requested comments or ideas from the GSAs on how to gather and disseminate the information. Mr. Zidar noted that staff and consultants would coordinate technical items with the TAC, the GSA representatives would need to consult with their Boards, then information to the Steering Committee and Board. Alternate Director Walt Ward questioned if any of the DWR comments were GSA-specific. Mr. Zidar noted that all comments received were kept at the Basin level and it is recommended that the response come through the GWA. Chairman Winn added that the response time of 6 months is not that long, and he has hopes that the discussions can be expedited and worked through as quickly as possible, as there is no need to wait until the last 30 days.

It was discussed if the comments from DWR was overreaching beyond the intent of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). Chairman Winn added that since the whole GSP process was brand new as of 2015, it is unknown where DWR gathered their guidelines for comments and there is hope that through discussions with DWR and other regions we can influence the outcome in the best direction for GSAs and GSP.

Ms. Valerie Kincaid, Attorney and member of the public asked to provide comments on the DWR comments and response. Ms. Kincaid further noted that there is some ambiguity on the response and comment timelines in SGMA legislature, as they pertain to the back-and-forth dialogue between DWR and GSAs; she noted that it is unclear how these dialogues will fit within the 180-day response period. Ms. Kincaid added that her advice to the group is to get the response right, not be in a hurry, work with DWR and stay the course. Ms. Kincaid additionally commented that the need for collaboration is important, noting that if certain GSAs want to make changes and separate GSPs are submitted, there is a coordination agreement needed. Ms. Kincaid added that she is happy to work with the consultant in reviewing comments. Additionally, Ms. Kincaid reminded that the DWR comments do say that the GSAs need to report and disclose subsidence to your area. Mr. Zidar questioned if Ms. Kincaid had any input as to how the structure of dialog should occur, technical and legal workgroups perhaps. Ms. Kincaid noted that other regions are doing similar work groups or teams, to what Mr. Zidar mentioned. Ms.

Kincaid added that her opinion would be to break up into a legal team, technical team, and policy team, with final review of the response done by the legal team. Director Robert Holmes added that he is in support of Ms. Kincaid's position. He additionally noted that his team at SSJID is prepared with legal, technical and policy team representatives and he encourages the other GSAs to be in the same position to have those representatives ready for the response teams to begin working.

4. Recommendations to the Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority Board – Woodard & Curran Task Order No. 5, David's Engineering Contract and Scope of Work, Budget Amendment Resolution

Mr. Zidar provided an overview of the items being recommended for approval by the GWA Board, Woodard & Curran (W&C) Task Order No. 5, David's Engineering Contract and Budget Amendment Resolution. Mr. Zidar provided the floor to Mr. Glenn Prasad of San Joaquin County to further explain. Mr. Prasad provided additional details, noting that there are three components to the W&C Task Order, assisting with Annual Report, assisting with Funding and Financing, and GSP Comment response. Mr. Prasad added that the David's Engineering Contract would assist with the Accounting Framework and the Funding and Financing plan and noted that this request requires additional funding from the reserves, but no additional call-for-cash is being requested. Mr. Zidar provided the Committee with a table showing the details of the budget amendment requested, noting the adopted budget details as well as the proposed. Mr. Zidar reiterated that the budget amendment is needed to fix an error in the budget worksheet, and a budget adjustment is needed to move approved appropriations from reserves to fund Task Order 5 for Woodard Curran's work.

Chairman Winn confirmed that these items would be a Steering Committee recommendation to the Board. Mr. Zidar advised that all three items needed to be recommended to the Board at the meeting immediately following this one. Chairman Winn advised that the Board presentation would need to be clear that the Steering Committee voted to recommend all items. Chairman Winn requested a motion and second to approve the recommendation of the W&C task Order No. 5, the David's Engineering Contract, and the Budget Amendment to the Board.

Motion: Director Robert Holmes
2nd: Alternate Director Walt Ward

Chairman Winn asked for any members opposed. With none, the motion passed unanimously.

5. Meeting Frequency and Schedule

Mr. Zidar reviewed the proposed revised meeting schedule for the GWA Board, requesting that Board Meetings be held monthly from January through June to accommodate discussions on the many pending and upcoming items. Mr. Zidar requested that the Steering Committee make the meeting schedule change recommendation to the Board for approval.

The Steering Committee made the motion to recommend to the Board monthly meetings through June.

Motion: Director Robert Holmes
2nd: Director Mike Henry

Chairman Winn asked for any members opposed. With none, the action passed unanimously.

6. TAC Discussion and Projects

Mr. Zidar provided details on Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) level discussions pertaining to the DWR SGMA Implementation Grant Proposal Solicitation Package and GWA Strategy. Mr. Zidar provided an overview noting that the comments to the PSP were released in draft form in October and that solicitation is open from December to January or possibly February. Mr. Zidar explained that in the first round, \$7.6 million would be awarded to each Critically Over Drafted (COD) Basin, but \$3.7 million of that is directed action or conditional. Mr. Zidar noted that we must be sure our application proposal includes this type of conditional project or the funds may be lost. Mr. Zidar further explained that the conditional projects could include geophysical investigations of groundwater basins to identify recharge potential, early implementation of existing flood management plans that incorporate groundwater recharge, or projects that would complement efforts of a GSP providing for floodplain expansion to benefit groundwater recharge or habitat.

Mr. Zidar noted that while we can have one proposal from the basin, there could be multiple projects included. Additionally, he noted that spending plans are requested to be included in proposal. Mr. Zidar advised that a call for projects was released and that two were received, from NSJWCD and the County. Mr. Zidar noted that the Steering Committee had previously authorized the TAC to evaluate and select the projects to be recommended to the Steering Committee and ultimately the Board for approval in January for grant application submittal in February.

Staff Reports:

1. DWR

Mr. Zidar deferred the updates by Ms. Chelsea Spier of DWR to the GWA Board Meeting occurring immediately following this meeting.

2. Other Items

No additional items to discuss.

3. Media Clippings

Mr. Zidar noted that the clippings included in the agenda package for member review and reference.

Public Comment:

None Provided.

Director Comment:

Alternate Director Walt Ward asked for clarification on the action to return to monthly Board Meetings and if they would be on the 2nd Wednesday of the month. Mr. Zidar advised yes and that a schedule would be forthcoming.

Future Agenda Items:

Mr. Zidar noted that the future agenda items would include the following:

DWR Comments on GSP and the response status
Basin Accounting Framework and the Basin Studies
Water Budget Modeling update
Grant PSP submittal

Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 9:33 a.m.

BEFORE THE STEERING COMMITTEE OF
EASTERN SAN JOAQUIN GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY

RESOLUTION

R-22-##

A RESOLUTION OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE OF THE EASTERN SAN JOAQUIN GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY (ESJGWA) DETERMINING TO CONDUCT MEETINGS OF THE ESJGWA STEERING COMMITTEE USING TELECONFERENCING PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE 54953 AS AMENDED BY AB 361 FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY 12, 2022 TO FEBRUARY 11, 2022.

WHEREAS, the Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority (the “Authority”) Steering Committee (the “Committee”) is committed to preserving and nurturing public access and participation in meetings of the Board of Directors; and

WHEREAS, all meetings the Authority’s legislative bodies are open and public, as required by the Ralph M. Brown Act (Cal. Gov. Code 54950 – 54963) (the “Brown Act”), so that any member of the public may attend, participate, and watch the Authority’s legislative bodies conduct their business; and

WHEREAS, the Brown Act, Government Code section 54953(e), as amended by AB 361 (2021), makes provisions for remote teleconferencing participation in meetings by members of a legislative body, without compliance with the requirements of Government Code section 54953(b)(3), subject to the existence of certain conditions; and

WHEREAS, the Committee previously adopted resolutions, on October 13, and November 10, finding that the requisite conditions exist for the legislative body of the District to conduct remote teleconference meetings without compliance with paragraph (3) of subdivision (b) of section 54953; and

WHEREAS, a required condition is that a state of emergency is declared by the Governor pursuant to Government Code section 8625, proclaiming the existence of conditions of disaster or of extreme peril to the safety of persons and property within the state caused by conditions as described in Government Code section 8558; and

WHEREAS, it is further required that state or local officials have imposed or recommended measures to promote social distancing, or the legislative body meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health and safety of attendees; and

WHEREAS, on March 4, 2020, the Governor proclaimed a State of Emergency to exist in California as a result of the threat of COVID-19; and

WHEREAS, Cal-OSHA adopted emergency regulations (Section 3205) imposing requirements on California employers, including measures to promote social distancing; and

WHEREAS, an Order of the San Joaquin County Public Health Officer acknowledges that close contact to other persons increases the risk of transmission of COVID-19; and

WHEREAS, currently the dominant strain of COVID-19 in the country, is more transmissible than prior variants of the virus, may cause more severe illness, and that even fully vaccinated individuals can spread the virus to others resulting in rapid and alarming rates of COVID-19 cases and hospitalizations, therefore, meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Committee as follows:

Section 1. Recitals. The Recitals set forth above are true and correct and are incorporated into this Resolution by this reference.

Section 2. Finding of Imminent Risk to Health or Safety of Attendees. The Committee hereby reconsiders the circumstances of the current State of Emergency proclaimed by the Governor on March 4, 2020, and finds that the current dominant strain of COVID-19 in the country, is more transmissible than prior variants of the virus, may cause more severe illness, and that even fully vaccinated individuals can spread the virus to others resulting in rapid and alarming rates of COVID-19 cases and hospitalizations has caused, and will continue to cause, conditions of peril to the safety of persons, thereby presenting an imminent risk to health and/or safety to the Authority's staff and attendees of the Authority's public meetings; and

Section 3. Teleconference Meetings. The Committee does hereby determine as a result of the State of Emergency proclaimed by the Governor, and the recommended measures to promote social distancing made by State and local officials that the Authority Steering Committee may conduct their meetings without compliance with paragraph (3) of subdivision (b) of Government Code section 54953, as authorized by subdivision (e)(1)(A) and (B) of section 54953, and shall comply with the requirements to provide the public with access to the meetings as prescribed in paragraph (2) of subdivision (e) of section 54953; and

Section 4. Direction to Staff. The Authority staff are hereby authorized and directed to take all actions necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of this Resolution including, conducting open and public meetings in accordance with Government Code section 54953(e) and other applicable provisions of the Brown Act.

Section 5. Effective Date of Resolution. This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED _____, by the following vote of the Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority Steering Committee, to wit:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

CHUCK WINN, Chairman

| Comment No. | DWR Comment on Deficiency | o | Category | Response |
|-------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Potential Deficiency 1. | The GSP lacks sufficient justification for identifying that undesirable results for chronic lowering of groundwater levels, subsidence, and depletion of interconnected surface waters can only occur in consecutive non-dry water year types. The GSP also lacks sufficient explanation for its chronic lowering of groundwater levels minimum thresholds and undesirable results. | | | |
| | The first potential deficiency relates to the GSP's requirement of two consecutive non-dry (i.e., below normal, above normal, or wet) water-year types and the exclusion of dry and critically dry water-year types in the identification of undesirable results for chronic lowering of groundwater levels, and, by proxy, land subsidence and depletions of interconnected surface water. | | | |
| | Regarding the first area of concern , the GSP identifies that an undesirable result occurs "when at least 25 percent of representative monitoring wells used to monitor groundwater levels (5 of 20 wells in the Subbasin) fall below their minimum level thresholds for two consecutive years that are categorized as non-dry years (below-normal, above-normal, or wet), according to the San Joaquin Valley Water Year Hydrologic Classification | | | |
| 1.1 | The water-year type requirement in the definition of the undesirable result for chronic lowering of groundwater levels (i.e., two consecutive non-dry years) is not consistent with the intent of SGMA. Because of this definition, GSAs in the Subbasin could disregard potential impacts of groundwater level declines below the minimum thresholds during extended periods of dry years, even if interrupted by normal or wet years. It appears the minimum thresholds already accommodate drought conditions, so it is unclear why the GSP's definition of undesirable results further excludes minimum threshold exceedances during dry water years. | a) Department staff believe the management approach described in the GSP, which couples minimum thresholds and measurable objectives that account for operational flexibility during dry periods with a definition of undesirable results that disregards minimum threshold exceedances in all years except consecutive below normal, above normal, or wet years, to be inconsistent with the objectives of SGMA. Therefore, the GSAs should remove the water-year type requirement from the GSP's undesirable result definition. | Clarification/ Additional Information | Recommend preparing separate GWL TM as appendix to the GSP that describes how the MT was developed and the logic/reasoning behind the water year-type designation; but perhaps reconsider keeping the dry-year designation. (Note, if you remove the dry-year designation, then a lot of these comments go away, especially wrt subsidence and ISW) |
| 1.2 | It appears the minimum thresholds already accommodate drought conditions, so it is unclear why the GSP's definition of undesirable results further excludes minimum threshold exceedances during dry water years. (See Potential Corrective Action 1.1.) | | Amend GSP to remove reference to water year type? Is this the easiest? Why would it matter? | Recommend removing water year type from SMC definition. |
| 1.3 | GSP does not sufficiently detail how projects and management actions, in conjunction with the proposed chronic lowering of groundwater levels sustainable management criteria, will offset drought-related groundwater reductions and avoid significant and unreasonable impacts when groundwater level minimum thresholds are potentially exceeded for an extended period in the absence of two consecutive non-dry years. (See Potential Corrective Action 1b.) | b) The GSP should be revised to include specific projects and management actions the GSAs would implement to offset drought-year groundwater level declines | Push Back | Groundwater level declines during dry years is 'normal' and expected. The important measure is that the water levels recover during non-dry years. The goal here is basin sustainability over the long term, so should not have projects that specifically offset drought-year groundwater level declines. The GSP provides a solution/ set of projects to address long-term groundwater sustainability of the basin by specifically targeting the basin's annual overdraft. Several drought conditions over the modeling period were considered when quantifying this annual overdraft. Hence, the GWA will be indirectly addressing overdraft through a more long-term approach (rather than a short-term drought response) via the implementation of the projects. With that said, individual management actions pertaining to drought scenarios are captured within agency-specific ag-water management plans, urban water management plans (which are included into the GSP by reference). |
| 1.4 | SGMA acknowledges that groundwater level declines during drought periods are not sufficient to cause an undesirable result for chronic lowering of groundwater levels; however, the statute does not similarly provide an exception for subsidence or stream depletion during periods of drought. (See Potential Corrective Action 1c.) | c) The GSAs should thoroughly explain how their approach avoids undesirable results for subsidence and depletion of interconnected surface waters, as SGMA does not include an allowance or exemption for those conditions to continue in periods of drought. | Additional technical analysis to demonstrate effectiveness of MTs for subsidence and ISW | Regs say "Chronic lowering of groundwater levels indicating a significant and unreasonable depletion of supply if continued over the planning and implementation horizon. Overdraft during a period of drought is not sufficient to establish a chronic lowering of groundwater levels if extractions and groundwater recharge are managed as necessary to ensure that reductions in groundwater levels or storage during a period of drought are offset by increases in groundwater levels or storage during other periods." Note that there is not similar language for subsidence and/or ISW. Prepare separate Subsidence/ISW TM documenting additional analysis to demonstrate how the MTs as currently set avoid undesirable results for subsidence and/or ISW in dry periods |
| 2 | Department staff's second area of concern is the GSP's evaluation of the effects of the proposed minimum thresholds and undesirable results on beneficial uses and users of groundwater. | | | |

| Comment No. | DWR Comment on Deficiency | o | Category | Response |
|-------------|--|---|--|--|
| 2.1 | The GSP builds an analysis of domestic wells going dry into its minimum thresholds, thereby considering the factors of wells going dry and the need for deeper well installations. However, it does not address how the management criteria address the other factors identified by the GSAs as potential undesirable results, including reductions in pumping capacity or increased pumping costs for shallow groundwater users, or adverse impacts to environmental uses and users. | d) Removing the water-year type requirement from the definition of an undesirable result (item a, above) would result in a GSP with groundwater level minimum thresholds designed to be generally protective of 90 percent of domestic wells regardless of regional hydrologic conditions. In that scenario, the GSAs should explain the rationale for determining that groundwater levels can exceed those thresholds at 25 percent of monitoring sites for two consecutive years before the effects would be considered significant and unreasonable. | Clarification/ Additional Information | Previously-mentioned GWL TM can provide the additional information describing how the 25% threshold was selected and demonstrating compliance with regs re: impacts on shallow domestic wells at threshold |
| 2.2 | Aside from the GSP's domestic well analysis, the only description of how minimum thresholds were evaluated to avoid undesirable results appears to be the statements that "for the majority of the Subbasin, GSA representatives identified no undesirable results, even if groundwater were to reach historical low groundwater levels" and that no GSA indicated undesirable results would occur "if the minimum threshold was set deeper than the [historic low] based on their understanding." The GSP provides no further explanation or description of how the individual GSAs concluded that there would be no undesirable results based on the minimum thresholds. | The GSAs should also explain how other factors they identified as "potential undesirable results" (e.g., adverse impacts to environmental uses and users) factored into selecting minimum thresholds and describe anticipated effects of the thresholds on beneficial uses and users of groundwater. Furthermore, the GSAs should explain whether other drinking water users that may rely on shallow wells, such as public water systems and state small water systems, were considered in the GSAs' site-specific thresholds. If not, the GSAs should conduct outreach with those users and incorporate their shallow wells, as applicable, into the site-specific minimum thresholds and measurable objectives. | Clarification/ Additional Information and/or Additional Technical Analysis (depending on the data set used in setting the MTs) | Previously-mentioned GWL TM can provide the additional information (or technical analysis, as required) describing the data used in establishing the MTs for GWL and demonstrating the consideration of those depending on shallow wells |
| 2.3 | The GSP does not justify or discuss how the GSAs developed the 25 percent threshold, nor does it explain or disclose the potential impacts anticipated during extended drier climate conditions using this threshold. In other words, the proposed management program may lead to potential effects on domestic wells or other beneficial uses and users during prolonged dry- or below-normal periods, and that information should, at a minimum, be disclosed and considered in the GSP. (See Potential Corrective Action 1d.) | | Clarification/ Additional Information | Previously-mentioned GWL TM can provide the additional information describing the factors used in selecting MT and anticipated impacts of the 25% threshold on groundwater users (e.g. number of domestic wells going dry, impacts to GDEs from changes in GWL) |
| 2.4 | The GSAs should describe how projects and management actions would address drinking water impacts due to continued overdraft between the start of GSP implementation and the achievement of the sustainability goal. If the GSP does not include projects or management actions to address drinking water impacts, the GSP should contain a thorough discussion, with supporting facts and rationale, explaining how and why GSAs determined not to include actions to address those impacts from continued groundwater lowering below pre-SGMA levels. (See Potential Corrective Action 1e.) | e) The GSAs should revise the GSP to describe how they would address drinking water impacts caused by continued overdraft during the period between the start of GSP implementation and achieving the sustainability goal. If the GSP does not include projects or management actions to address those impacts, the GSP should contain a thorough discussion, with supporting facts and rationale, explaining how and why the GSAs determined not to include specific actions to address drinking water impacts from continued groundwater lowering below pre-SGMA levels. | Push Back | The GSP regulations and SMC BMP notes that GWLs below MTs may occur during the 20 year implementation period. Per SGMA regulations, it's impacts occurring after sustainability is reached (after the 20 year implementation period) that require mitigation. Also consider removing the water year designation from the SMC definition |
| 2.5 | The GSAs have not explained how those groundwater level declines relate to the degradation of groundwater quality sustainability indicator. GSAs must describe, among other items, the relationship between minimum thresholds for a given sustainability indicator (in this case, chronic lowering of groundwater levels) and the other sustainability indicators..... The GSAs generally commit to monitoring a wide range of water quality constituents but they have only developed sustainable management criteria for total dissolved solids because they state they have not observed a causal nexus between groundwater management and degradation associated with the other constituents. While Department staff are not aware of evidence sufficient to conclude that the GSAs acted unreasonably by focusing on total dissolved solids, it is clear that the GSAs did not consider, or at least did not document, the potential for degradation to occur due to further lowering of groundwater levels beyond the historic lows. (See Potential Corrective Action 1f.) | f) The GSP should be revised to explain how the GSAs will assess groundwater quality degradation in areas where further groundwater level decline, below historic lows, is allowed via the minimum thresholds. The GSAs should further describe how they will coordinate with the appropriate groundwater users, including drinking water, environmental, and irrigation users as identified in the GSP. The GSAs should also discuss efforts to coordinate with water quality regulatory agencies and programs in the Subbasin to understand and develop a process for determining if continued lowering of groundwater levels is resulting in degraded water quality in the Subbasin during GSP implementation. | Clarification/ Additional Information | Modify GSP to more clearly address outreach/coordination requirements and to expand discussion on SMC for groundwater quality |

| Comment No. | DWR Comment on Deficiency | o | Category | Response |
|-------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| Potential Deficiency 2. | <p>The GSP does not provide enough information to support the use of the chronic lowering of groundwater level sustainable management criteria and representative monitoring network as a proxy for land subsidence.</p> <p>GSA's must demonstrate a significant correlation between groundwater levels and land subsidence and must demonstrate that groundwater level minimum thresholds represent a reasonable proxy for avoiding land subsidence undesirable results. Additionally, the GSA's must demonstrate how the monitoring network is adequate to identify undesirable results for both metrics.</p> | <p>Potential Corrective Action 2</p> <p>The GSA's must provide detailed information to demonstrate how the use of the chronic lowering of groundwater level minimum thresholds are sufficient as a proxy to detect and avoid significant and unreasonable land subsidence that substantially interferes with surface land uses. Alternatively, the GSA's could commit to utilizing direct monitoring for subsidence, e.g., with remotely sensed subsidence data provided by the Department. In that case, the GSA's should develop sustainable management criteria based on rates and extents of subsidence.</p> | | <p>Consider revising land subsidence monitoring network to include existing survey benchmarks as contained in UNAVCO's GAGE UNR's Geodesy websites (see Michelle Sneed email to Brandon Nakagawa). Also note that GSP says that InSAR surveys will be analyzed annual report</p> |
| 3.1 | <p>Department staff find that the GSP does not adequately identify or define minimum thresholds and undesirable results for land subsidence. The GSP also does not provide adequate justification and explanation for using the groundwater level minimum thresholds and representative monitoring network as a proxy for land subsidence.</p> | | <p>Clarification/ Additional Information</p> | <p>Either in GSP or as separate TM, provide additional information to explain/justify approach for monitoring and analyzing for land subsidence</p> |
| 3.2 | <p>The GSP does not identify specific infrastructure locations, particularly those associated with public safety, in the Subbasin and the rate and extent of subsidence that would substantially interfere with those land surface uses and may lead to undesirable results.</p> | | <p>Clarification/ Additional Information</p> | <p>Describe geology and causes of inelastic land subsidence to show that (1) subsidence w/ peat soils is different mechanism and (2) areas w/o Corcoran or other significant clay layers are unlikely to subside. Need to focus on where Corcoran exists and sub-Corcoran pumping.</p> <p>Reach out to GSA's to identify 'critical' infrastructure and to assess the amount of differential settlement that can occur before the use of those conveyances are impacted. Modify GSP to add in this information and address this comment</p> |
| 3.3 | <p>Department staff find the GSP does not provide adequate evidence to demonstrate a significant correlation between groundwater levels and land subsidence in the Subbasin</p> | | <p>Additional Technical Study</p> | <p>Do specific study to demonstrate linkages between GWL and subsidence <u>or</u> change subsidence monitoring network to use existing survey benchmarks and InSAR analyses (see other GSPs for examples)</p> |
| 3.4 | <p>The GSP fails to provide adequate evidence to evaluate further this correlation, specifically concerning potential subsidence caused by groundwater levels falling below historic lows, as would be allowed by the groundwater level minimum thresholds set in the GSP.</p> | | <p>Clarification/ Additional Information</p> | <p>Describe geology and causes of inelastic land subsidence to show that (1) subsidence w/ peat soils is different mechanism and (2) areas w/o Corcoran or other significant clay layers are unlikely to subside. Need to focus on where Corcoran exists and sub-Corcoran pumping.</p> |
| 3.5 | <p>The GSP presents no analysis of historic groundwater levels or historically dewatered subsurface materials to support the conclusion that the geologic units are not compressible.</p> | <p>1. The GSA's should revise the GSP to identify the total subsidence that critical infrastructure in the Subbasin can tolerate during GSP implementation. Support this identification with information on the effects of subsidence on land surface beneficial uses and users and the amount of subsidence that would substantially interfere with those uses and users.</p> | <p>Clarification/ Additional Information and/or Additional Technical Analysis</p> | <p>Describe geology and causes of inelastic land subsidence to show that (1) subsidence w/ peat soils is different mechanism and (2) areas w/o Corcoran or other significant clay layers are unlikely to subside. Need to focus on where Corcoran exists and sub-Corcoran pumping.</p> |
| 3.6 | <p>The GSP does not provide an evaluation showing how additional declines in groundwater levels would only affect subsurface materials similar to those which have been historically dewatered.</p> | <p>2. The GSA's should revise the GSP to document a significant correlation between groundwater levels and specific amounts or rates of land subsidence. The analysis should account for potential subsidence related to groundwater level declines below historical lows and further declines that are allowed to exceed minimum thresholds. This analysis should demonstrate that groundwater level declines allowed during GSP implementation are preventative of the rates and magnitudes of land subsidence considered significant and unreasonable based on the identified infrastructure of concern. If there is not sufficient data to establish a correlation, the GSA's should consider other options such as direct monitoring of land subsidence (e.g., remotely sensed data provided by the Department, extensometers, or GPS stations) until such time that the GSA's can establish a correlation.</p> | <p>Additional technical analysis</p> | <p>Mine existing land surface elevation databases and conduct analysis correlating historic groundwater elevations with land surface elevation data to see if a pattern exists. Include in this analysis documentation of subbasin geology and information relative to where subsidence is likely to occur based on hydrostratigraphy and the associated subsidence mechanisms (e.g., oxidation of peaty soils vs. sub-Corcoran pumping)</p> <p>Prepare TM summarizing technical analysis</p> |

| Comment No. | DWR Comment on Deficiency | o | Category | Response |
|-------------|---|--|--------------------------------|--|
| 3.7 | The GSP is unclear on whether the conditions required to identify an undesirable result for chronic lowering of groundwater levels in the Subbasin are also required to identify an undesirable result for land subsidence. Management proposed in the GSP could allow groundwater level minimum thresholds to be exceeded in periods where two consecutive non-dry years do not occur, which does not support the claim that only materials up to the deepest groundwater level minimum threshold (205 feet below ground surface) will be dewatered. | 3. The GSAs should explain how the groundwater level representative monitoring network is sufficient to detect significant and unreasonable subsidence that may substantially interfere with land uses, specifically any identified infrastructure of concern. If the groundwater level monitoring network alone is not adequate, based on specific infrastructure locations, Department staff suggest incorporating continued analysis of available InSAR data to cover areas with data gaps. | Resell subsidence mntr network | Consider revising land subsidence monitoring network to include existing survey benchmarks as contained in UNAVCO's GAGE UNR's Geodesy websites (see Michelle Sneed email to Brandon Nakagawa). Also note that GSP says that InSAR surveys will be analyzed annually as part of GSP implementation |



Memo

To: TAC and Steering Committee

From: Matt Zidar, Water Resources Manager

RE : DWR SGMA Implementation Grant and ESJ GSP Projects

Date: December 30, 2021, Item A.4

A. BACKGROUND

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) 2021 Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) Implementation Grant proposal solicitation package (PSP) has been finalized. Singular proposals for each critically overdraft (COD) subbasin are due February 18, 2022. Consistent with the grant guidelines, the Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority (GWA) defined a competitive process that included a call for projects which closed November 9, 2021. Two primary projects were received, one from the North San Joaquin Water Conservation District (NSJWCD) and another from San Joaquin County. The Spending Plan was designed with input from DWR staff, local project proponents and input from prospective service providers.

B. OVERVIEW OF CRITICALLY OVERDRAFT FUNDING

SGMA Implementation Grant Round 1 is only for COD basins and \$3.9 M is to be available to the ESJ Subbasin and GWA. An additional \$3.7 M (increasing the possible total to \$7.6 M) will be available for projects that can provide the following actions and project types defined by DWR: (1) geophysical investigation(s) of groundwater basins to identify recharge potential (i.e. Aerial Electromagnetic Surveys); (2) early implementation of existing regional flood management plans that incorporate groundwater recharge (e.g. basin recharge using floodwater); or (3) projects that would complement efforts of a Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP), that provide floodplain expansion to benefit groundwater recharge or habitat (e.g. basin recharge using peak flows from a river, creek, or stream). It should be noted that if the subbasin cannot find a way to allocate the \$3.7M to the defined project actions and types, that money will be available to DWR to reallocate to other areas of the greater San Joaquin Valley. The PSP also says that subbasins should submit a Spending Plan for no less than \$10M.

C. EASTERN SAN JOAQUIN GROUNDWATER SUBBASIN DRAFT SPENDING PLAN

1. Spending Plan Summary

The attached Spending Plan will be the basis of the ESJ Grant Application. Project proponents will split the cost for grant preparation.

The goals for the Spending Plan are;

- a. Meet local GSP Project Management Action (PMA) objectives using state monies to keep local costs down

-
- b. Capture and leverage state money to use for meeting Federal local match funding requirements under the recently passed infrastructure bill (US Bureau, US Dept of Ag, US Corps of Engineers funding)
 - c. Seek to ensure capture of the full DWR defined action \$3.7
 - d. Get 'brick and mortar' projects under construction to demonstrate success and progress in implementing the ESJ GSP planned projects
 - e. Develop plans project for beneficial use of the 1990 Mokelumne River Water Right (Application 29835) to demonstrate due diligence in anticipation of further State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Administrative Hearing Officer (AHO)
 - f. Provide related activities to support and compliment the DWR Pilot Calaveras Watershed Study (FloodMAR study)
 - g. Develop multi benefit projects that meet multiple objectives as identified in the GSP and by the member GSAs.

An explanation of the program items in the Spending Plan Table (attached) are presented below. Note that the General SGMA Allocation (\$3.9 M: column C) and the Directed Action Allocation (\$3.7 M; Col D) add up to the available \$7.6 M. The additional budget in Additional Allocation (\$2.4 M) bring the total ask up to the DWR requested \$10M funding Plan. We could go higher than the \$2.4 M. This number leaves DWR and the GWA room to negotiate how to best meet the Directed Action work items or to provide flexibility should the Legislature provide more of the identified budget surplus for the SGMA Implementation Grant program.

There are two primary components; Component 1 Eastern San Joaquin Geophysical Investigations and Groundwater Recharge Program proposed by San Joaquin County (SJC) includes tasks to support both projects on the Mokelumne and Cosumnes Rivers, and which would provide benefit to the GWA area. This seeks to maximize the use of the DWR Directed Action money (\$3.7M) and leave room to capture money up to the \$10M total spending plan, while also allowing flexibility in the work to be conducted. Component 2 North System Improvements Project proposed by NSJWCD seeks to use all the General SGMA Implementation Grant money (\$3.9 M) and modernize existing and construct new capital facilities.

Within Component 1 Eastern San Joaquin Geophysical Investigations and Groundwater Recharge Program there are two primary phases; Phase 1 – Project Development & Geophysical Characterization and Groundwater Storage Pre design and Constraints Analysis is comprised of 8 tasks and Phase 2 Mokelumne Recharge Flood Plain Enhancement Environmental/ Design comprised of 4 tasks.

2. Component 1: Phase 1: Project Development & Geophysical Characterization

Task 1.1 Groundwater Recharge Assessment Tool (GRAT) Implementation has been discussed at the TAC. This will help develop facility layouts and costs for in lieu, direct recharge, and flood water spreading operations in the SEWD, NSJWCD, and CSJWCD areas and allow for outreach and interaction with landowners and growers who could take waters for beneficial use.

1.2 Regional Recharge Potential Geographic Information Systems Analysis and Screening is to apply GIS to physical constraints to identify and map the best recharge opportunities using existing information. This data is intended to compliment information to be obtained by DWR under separate funding for Aerial Electromagnetic (AEM) Surveys using helicopters. The AEM will characterize the subsurface geology at a regional scale and help improve the understanding of basin geology.

1.3 Geophysical Site Assessment tTEM Survey/CPT is to provide design level of detail to confirm sites that are most appropriate for recharge and may have willing growers as identified in Task 1.1 for the GRAT development. tTEM is electromagnetic geophysics that provide finer level of detail and resolution and design level of detail for specific sites, especially when coupled with use of Cone Penetrometers to gather geologic logs and train the electromagnetic interpretation.

1.4 Source Water Available for Recharge/ Water Availability Analysis is to support analysis of the water available for recharge from the Mokelumne River (Application 29835) held by the Mokelumne River Water and Power Authority, the Small East Side Streams water rights application held by the SEWD, and potentially water available from the Calaveras River. This work will also support SWRCB consideration of the application and issuance of permits.

1.5 Climate Change and Water Quality Vulnerability Analysis is to improve climate change resilience, and gather and map water quality data from existing monitoring networks to evaluate/consider water quality opportunities and constraints when locating potential water recharge facilities, help priorities locations and to avoid, minimize or mitigate for any potential water quality impacts during design of facilities. This data set will also help with addressing water quality impairments to small and domestic water systems and beneficial uses.

1.6 Environmental Flood/ Habitat Enhancement Project Development is to apply GIS and existing resource maps to identify opportunities to complement efforts of a local GSP which provide for floodplain expansion to benefit groundwater recharge or habitat (e.g., basin recharge using peak flows from a river, creek, or stream) on both small local streams and on the Mokelumne and Calaveras River. In combination with the other Geophysical work, this effort will be sensitive to private property considerations, seek to evaluate Surface Water/Groundwater interactions and areas where there are groundwater dependent ecosystems. The Natural Communities Commonly Associated with Groundwater (NCCAG)

Dataset, which was developed by DWR to assist GSAs in the preparation and implementation of GSPs will be revisited and utilized for this analysis.

1.7 Project Alternatives Analysis Engineered Facilities, Modeling and Preliminary Benefits Quantification. This task is intended to identify and model the potential benefits of putting the Water Available for Recharge identified in Task 1.4 to beneficial use for in lieu, direct are flood spreading on lands identified through Tasks 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3. This will help support environmental review of proposed project and to quantify benefits to be achieved for the ESJ Groundwater subbasin.

1.8 FloodMAR Field, On Farm Pilot Demonstration Program is to work with willing growers and the local water districts to conduct on farm demonstration of floodwater spreading operations to prove the concept, gain grower acceptance, and study closely the impacts and benefits of such operations. This work might be funded by other DWR programs and may not need to be included in the grant.

3. Component 1: Phase 2: Mokelumne Recharge Flood Plain Enhancement – Environmental/ Design

Component 1, Phase 2 Mokelumne Recharge Flood Plain Enhancement Environmental/ Design contains the following tasks and activities. The outcome of this work is a preferred project at a 30% design level able to be evaluated pursuant to CEQA/NEPA.

Task 2.1 Engineering Facility/ Conveyance Alternatives Formulation & Screening is to review prior planned projects to integrate physical facilities and operations into a series of alternatives that can be compared and support definition of a preferred project. Different alternatives will be configured and evaluate against defined objectives and constraints.

2.2 Preliminary Design Report (Selected Alternative) 30%. This would be to provide a project description and costs at a level of detail that can undergo environmental review and begin the permitting process.

2.3 IS/ PEIR (CEQA/ NEPA) is to conduct the public scoping process required by statute, and to develop the program and/or project level environmental review (EIR/EIS) that would support lead agency decisions by the SWRCB on the water rights applications, and decisions by the GWA and GSA partners on the project to be implemented.

2.4 Finance/ Rate Study, Economic Analysis. Using the analysis from Phase 1 that quantified benefits, and the engineering designs in Phase 2, this work is to initiate economic analysis and rate study to identify funding and financing strategies.

4. Component 2: North San Joaquin Water Conservation District North System Improvement Project

Component 2 North System Improvements Project Sponsored by the NNSJWCD will be to rehabilitate and construct the water distribution systems and allow for use of the full surface water rights and entitlements held by the District. The anticipated yield of the project is 5,000 AFY. Benefits would include reduction in overdraft, increase groundwater levels, reduced pumping costs, recharge of clean Mokelumne River water to preserve, or improve water quality for all beneficial uses (small and domestic water systems, underserved communities, growers), increase reliability of supplies and drought resiliency, and an ability to respond to climate change.

Attachment 4.2

PRELIMINARY DRAFT SPENDING PLAN (FOR DISCUSSION ONLY)

| Task | Description | General SGMA Allocation | Directed Action Allocation | Additional Allocation (DWR requirement) | Budget |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|---|----------------------|
| COMPONENT 1 | EASTERN SAN JOAQUIN GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATIONS AND GROUNDWATER RECHARGE PROJECT (SJC) | | | | |
| PHASE 1: PROJECT DEVELOPMENT & GEOTECHNICAL CHARACTERIZATION AND GROUNDWATER STORAGE PRE-DESIGN AND CONSTRAINT | | | | | |
| 1.1 | Groundwater Recharge Assessment Tool (GRAT) Implementation | | \$ 400,000 | \$ 100,000 | \$ 500,000 |
| 1.2 | Regional Recharge Potential GIS Analysis and Screening | | \$ 100,000 | \$ 75,000 | \$ 175,000 |
| 1.3 | Geophysical Site Assessment tTEM Survey/CPT | | \$ 400,000 | \$ 100,000 | \$ 500,000 |
| 1.4 | Source Water Available for Recharge/ Water Availability Analysis | | \$ 200,000 | | \$ 200,000 |
| 1.5 | Water Quality Characterization | | \$ 50,000 | \$ 50,000 | \$ 100,000 |
| 1.6 | Environmental Flood/ Habitat Enhancement Project Development | | \$ 250,000 | \$ 100,000 | \$ 350,000 |
| 1.7 | Project Alternatives Analysis Engineered Facilities. Modeling and Preliminary Benefits Quantification. | | \$ 250,000 | | \$ 250,000 |
| 1.8 | FloodMAR Field, On Farm Pilot Demonstration Program | | | \$ 575,000 | \$ 575,000 |
| PHASE 2: MOKELUMNE RECHARGE FLOOD PLAIN ENHANCEMENT - ENVIRONMENTAL/ DESIGN | | | | | |
| 2.1 | Engineering Facility/ Conveyance Alternatives Formulation & Screening | | \$ 300,000 | | \$ 300,000 |
| 2.2 | Preliminary Design Report (Selected Alternative) 30% | | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 200,000 | \$ 1,200,000 |
| 2.3 | IS/ PEIR (CEQA/ NEPA) | | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 200,000 | \$ 1,200,000 |
| 2.4 | Finance/ Rate Study, Economic Analysis | | \$ 150,000 | | \$ 150,000 |
| | Total | \$ | \$ 3,700,000 | \$ 1,300,000 | \$ 5,000,000 |
| COMPONENT 2 | NORTH SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT (NSJWCD) | | | | |
| | NSJWCD North System | \$ 3,900,000 | | \$ 1,100,000 | \$ 5,000,000 |
| TOTAL SPENDING PLAN | | \$ 3,900,000 | \$ 3,700,000 | \$ 2,400,000 | \$ 10,000,000 |
| PHASE 3: IMPLEMENTATION | | | | | |
| 3.1 | Project Environmental Permitting/ Mitigation | | | | \$ 3,000,000 |

PRELIMINARY DRAFT SPENDING PLAN (FOR DISCUSSION ONLY)

| Task | Description | General SGMA Allocation | Directed Action Allocation | Additional Allocation (DWR requirement) | Budget |
|------|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|---|----------------|
| 3.2 | Right of Way Acquisition & Project Surveying & Flood Easements | | | | \$ 10,000,000 |
| 3.3 | Engineering Design Services | | | | \$ 4,000,000.0 |
| 3.4 | Project Construction (Component 1 - Recharge Facility) | | | | \$ 40,000,000 |
| | Total Project Cost | | | | \$ 62,000,000 |

| PROJECT ADMINISTRATION (IN-KIND OR FUTURE FUNDING) | | | | | |
|--|---|--|-----|--|----------------|
| 4.1 | Engineering During Design | | 5% | | \$ 3,100,000 |
| 4.2 | Construction Administration and Management Services | | 10% | | \$ 6,200,000 |
| 4.3 | Staff Administration | | 5% | | \$ 3,100,000.0 |
| 4.4 | Grant Reporting | | 3% | | \$ 1,550,000 |
| | Total Project Administration | | | | \$ 13,950,000 |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------|--|--|--|--|----------------------|
| GRAND TOTAL | | | | | \$ 75,950,000 |
|--------------------|--|--|--|--|----------------------|

| OTHER PROJECTS | | | | | |
|----------------|--|----|----|------------|------------|
| 1 | SEWD: Fish passage improvement across an existing crossing | | | | \$ |
| 2 | SEWD: Floodplain development for FloodMAR and Habitat | | | | \$ |
| 3 | SEWD: Habitat improvements | | | | \$ |
| 4 | City of Stockton: MUD's Recharge Basin Improvement | | | \$750,000 | \$ 750,000 |
| | Project Geophysical Investigation Study | | | | |
| | Total Other Projects | \$ | \$ | \$ 750,000 | \$ 750,000 |

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
EASTERN SAN JOAQUIN GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY**

RESOLUTION R-22-____

**RESOLUTION APPROVING SUBMITTAL OF A GRANT APPLICATION AND SPENDING
PLAN FOR AN AMOUNT OF \$10,000,000 TO THE DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
FOR THE SUSTAINABLE GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT ACT IMPLEMENTATION GRANT
UNDER THE SUSTAINABLE GROUNDWATER PLANNING GRANT PROGRAM**

WHEREAS, the Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority (“ESJGWA”) is a Joint Powers Authority created pursuant to California statute, and which is a public entity separate and apart from the Members; and

WHEREAS, the ESJGWA was formed to provide coordination among the Members to develop and implement a Groundwater Sustainability Plan (“GSP”) for the Eastern San Joaquin Subbasin (“Basin”) in accordance with the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act of 2014 (“SGMA”); and

WHEREAS, the ESJGWA has coordinated among the Members the development of a GSP covering the entire Basin, and submitted it to the Department of Water Resources (“DWR”) for their review and acceptance; and

WHEREAS, DWR is accepting SMGA Implementation grant applications with an accompanying spending plan from Critically Overdrafted Basins (“CODs”) for the Sustainable Groundwater Management Grant Program; and

WHEREAS, only one application and accompanying spending plan will be accepted by DWR per COD Basin and the applicant must meet the eligibility requirements listed within the Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) and the 2021 Guidelines; and,

WHEREAS, the Eastern San Joaquin Subbasin (ESJ Subbasin), DWR Basin No. 5-22.01 has, been designated by DWR as a Critically Overdrafted Basin, and the GWA eligible to submit a grant application and accompanying spending plan for up to \$10 million on behalf of the ESJ Subbasin; and

WHEREAS, after DWR’s acceptance, the ESJGWA will be eligible for a minimum grant award of \$3.9 million, and an additional \$3.7 million, if requested, for tasks and activities that include (1) geophysical investigation(s) of groundwater basins to identify recharge potential, (2) early implementation of existing regional flood management plans that incorporate groundwater recharge, and (3) projects that would complement efforts of a local GSP, that provide floodplain expansion to benefit groundwater recharge or habitat; and

WHEREAS, in February 2022, at a regularly scheduled ESJGWA board meeting, the GSAs in the Basin reviewed a Spending Plan for \$10 million that included the North System Improvements Project sponsored by the North San Joaquin Water Conservation District, and the Eastern San Joaquin Geophysical Investigations and Groundwater Recharge Program sponsored by the San Joaquin County; and

WHEREAS, as stipulated in the DWR PSP, a review committee comprising the GWA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) members has reviewed and scored the aforementioned projects, and both projects have been qualified by the TAC for inclusion in the Spending Plan.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority supports the Spending Plan, grant application, and the projects contained therein, and accepts the application as the sole application to be submitted on behalf of the ESJ Subbasin.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Board of Directors of the Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority hereby approves submittal of an application containing the Spending Plan attached hereto (Exhibit A) in the amount of \$10,000,000 to the California Department of Water Resources for the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act Implementation Grant, under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Program, and entering into an agreement to receive said funds.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Secretary of the Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority or designee is hereby directed and authorized to prepare the necessary data, conduct investigations, file such application, execute a grant agreement and any subsequent amendments thereto with California Department of Water Resources, and take other actions as necessary and appropriate to obtain Grant funding and complete the projects within the application.

PASSED and ADOPTED this 9th day of February, 2022 by the following vote of the Board of Directors of the Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Authority, to wit:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ATTEST: KRIS BALAJI, PMP, P.E.
Secretary of the
Eastern San Joaquin
Groundwater Authority

CHUCK WINN, Chairman
Board of Directors of the
Eastern San Joaquin
Groundwater Authority

December 2021 DWR Updates (from DWR's North Central Region Office)

Grants

California Grants Portal

The California State Library, in partnership with the Department of Water Resources and other state grantmaking agencies, has launched the California Grants Portal – your one destination to find all state grant and loan opportunities provided on a first-come or competitive basis. Visit grants.ca.gov to find funding opportunities for you and your community.

DWR: DRAFT 2022 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines and Proposal Solicitation Package

We are pleased to announce the release of the DRAFT 2022 IRWM Grant Program Guidelines and Proposal Solicitation Package (GL/PSP) for the Proposition 1 - Round 2 IRWM Implementation Grant (linked and attached for reference) for public review. Release of the drafts commences a 60-day public comment period, which will close at 5:00 pm on February 8, 2021. This solicitation will make **approximately \$192 million** in grant funding available for IRWM implementation projects. *Please note that the draft identifies a March 2022 deadline for Cycle 1 as originally proposed in early 2021. DWR will update this deadline to later in 2022 in the final Proposal Solicitation Package based on the public comments collected.* For more information on the Proposition 1 IRWM Implementation Grant Program, visit [Implementation Grant Program](https://www.water.ca.gov/irwm) or e-mail us at: dwr_irwm@water.ca.gov.

DWR: FINAL SGMA Funding Guidelines and Proposal Solicitation Package

The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) has released the final [Guidelines](#) and [Proposal Solicitation Package](#) (PSP) for the [Sustainable Groundwater Management \(SGM\) Grant Program's](#) Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) Implementation Funding. Over \$350 million in grants will be available for planning and implementation projects to help regional groundwater agencies comply with the SGMA. **The Round 1 grant solicitation for Critically Overdrafted (COD) basins is now open.** Those potential applicants located within COD basins will be contacted by a SGM Grant Program team member to provide the required templates for applicants to use while applying for the grant program. The Round 1 solicitation will **end on February 18, 2022.**

DWR: \$200 Million Drought Funding to Support Small Communities

DWR released [guidelines](#) for how small water systems may apply for funds as part of the Small Community Drought Relief Program. Eligible projects must be designed to benefit small communities (< 3,000 connections or 3,000 AFY) located in counties under Governor Newsom's drought emergency proclamations or which the SWRCB may determine that drought conditions necessitate urgent and immediate action. Small communities impacted by the drought are encouraged to apply as soon as possible as funds will be dispersed on a first come first serve basis and can submit applications or questions to SmallCommunityDrought@water.ca.gov. This grant will fund projects that provide immediate or interim drinking water supplies such as hauled or bottled water deliveries, deepening of wells, new or temporary water tank storage, new pipelines and connections to more reliable nearby systems, etc. No local cost share is required.

Department of Conservation: Multibenefit Land Repurposing Program DRAFT Guidelines open for comment

The Multi-Benefit Land Repurposing Program seeks to increase regional capacity to repurpose agricultural land to reduce reliance on groundwater while providing community health, economic wellbeing, water supply, habitat, renewable energy, and climate benefits. **A total of \$50 million will be available**, with up to \$10 million per basin. [Draft Grant Guidelines and links to January public workshops \(1/18, 1/19, & 1/20\) can be found here.](#) Public comments can be sent to shanna.atherton@conservation.ca.gov. **Public comment closes January 31, 2022 and application release expected 2/4/22 with submission due date of March 21, 2022.**

December 2021 DWR Updates (from DWR's North Central Region Office)

CalFire: Fire Prevention Grants Program FY 2021-2022

CAL FIRE's Fire Prevention Grants Program provides funding for fire prevention projects and activities in and near fire threatened communities. Funded activities include hazardous fuels reduction, wildfire prevention planning, and wildfire prevention education with an emphasis on improving public health and safety while reducing greenhouse gas emissions. **Approximately \$120 Million available, no funding match required, application deadline is 2/9/22.** [More information can be found here.](#)

Other state & federal grant websites for resources that may be helpful are:

- California Financing Coordinating Committee -- <https://cfcc.ca.gov/>, and
- CalOES grants -- <https://www.caloes.ca.gov/cal-oes-divisions/grants-management>
- US EPA -- <https://www.epa.gov/grants/specific-epa-grant-programs>, and
- Economic Development Administration -- <https://eda.gov/funding-opportunities/>

Upcoming conferences, webinars, new reports and data

NEW: DWR and the State Water Resources Control Board have released new [principles and strategies for groundwater management and drinking water wells](#). The document provides a framework for the development of drought-resistant communities. Approximately 82 percent of Californians rely on groundwater for some portion of their [drinking water](#) or other household uses. A [Spanish version](#) of the draft is available.

DWR: DRAFT Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP) Conservation Strategy 2022

The Conservation Strategy is an integral component of the 2022 CVFPP Update. Its purpose is to provide actionable and measurable targets to improve riverine, aquatic, wetland, and riparian habitat in the flood system through the integration of ecological principles with flood risk reduction projects, operation and maintenance activities, institutional support, and other means (e.g., the removal of fish passage barriers). The Conservation Strategy also provides data, information, and guidance to floodplain managers to assist in the development of multi-benefit flood infrastructure improvement projects by integrating project components and management strategies that benefit native species and their habitats. [The draft document is now available on DWR's website](#) There will be a 60-day review period for the Draft Conservation Strategy; as such, **DWR will be accepting comments until February 10, 2022.** Comments can be submitted via the [webform here](#) or emailed to CScComments@water.ca.gov.

FIRO Workshop and Webinars in January and March

The next Forecast Informed Reservoir Operations (FIRO) Workshop will look at FIRO as a climate resiliency strategy. This is part of a webinar series hosted by the Center for Western Weather and Water Extremes. The workshop will be held Wednesday, Jan.12 and the 8th annual workshop will be held March 21-24 (tentative). [More information can be found here.](#)

DWR Released California's Groundwater Update 2020 (formerly Bulletin 118) and California's Groundwater Live Online

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) today released the final [California's Groundwater – Update 2020 \(Bulletin-118\)](#), containing information on the condition of the State's groundwater, which is especially important with most of California facing ongoing drought conditions. DWR has also developed a companion web-based application called [California's Groundwater Live](#) (CalGW Live), leveraging the [California Natural Resources Agency Open Data Platform](#) (Open Data) to improve the access and timeliness of statewide groundwater information. The easy-to-use interface will make many of the data sets used in CalGW Update 2020 available in an interactive map format that will be updated regularly for viewing and downloading. For more information, visit the updated [California's Groundwater website](#) Contact: CalGW@water.ca.gov

December 2021 DWR Updates (from DWR's North Central Region Office)

OpenET makes tracking water use data easier with satellite data

A space-based tool is ready to help track water in the western U.S. Using data from satellites, [Open Evapotranspiration](#) (OpenET) gives farmers and other water users information on how much of their water loss ends up as evapotranspiration. The OpenET data are available for 17 western states, including the Colorado River basin area.

Week of Webinars on Statewide Groundwater Management Efforts

DWR is hosting a week of webinars on statewide groundwater management efforts. **All presentations were recorded and the links are below and can also be found on the program webpage.**

- [2022 Groundwater Sustainability Plan \(GSP\) Submittal Workshop](#)
- [2022 Alternative 5-year Update Submittal Workshop](#)
- [Resources for Sustainable Groundwater Management Act \(SGMA\) Implementation](#) (found under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Program Events tab)
- [Accessing Groundwater Data and Tools](#)

Water Board: Drinking water needs assessments

For the first time, the State Water Resources Control Board has completed a comprehensive look at California water systems that are struggling to provide safe drinking water. [The needs assessment](#) identifies failing water systems and those at risk of failing. It also offers the most in-depth view of long-term drinking water safety the state has ever had. Details are available in this [news release](#).

SGMA

Dry Well Reporting Site

There is a website available to [report private wells going dry](https://mydrywatersupply.water.ca.gov/report/) at <https://mydrywatersupply.water.ca.gov/report/>. This information reported to this site is intended to inform state and local agencies on drought impacts on household water supplies. The data reported on this site (excluding personal identifiable information) can be viewed on the [SGMA data viewer](#) or downloaded on the [CNRA Atlas](#). Individuals or local agencies can report water shortages and [a list of resources are included on the webpage](#). The reporting forms are available in both English and Spanish.

DWR is developing eight Proposition 68-funded technical projects

These projects include airborne electromagnetic surveys, improving groundwater elevation and quality monitoring networks, Statewide land use data collection, improved subsidence monitoring network, installing and maintaining stream gauges, maintaining and enhancing statewide well completion reports, managing and reporting sustainable groundwater information, and enhancing and maintaining DWR's modeling tools. Fact sheets on each project can be viewed under the "Prop 68" tab [here](#).

- [AEM webpage](#) contains information on the how the process works, safety, schedule, data submission by GSAs, TAC, pilot study data and more. Public webinar was held **June 8th 12:00 – 1:00**, a [recording can be viewed here](#) and [handouts can be downloaded here](#). **Sonoma Valley Basins were surveyed in November, 2021 and North San Joaquin and Southern Sacramento basins planned for surveying in April 2022.**
- [2018 Statewide Crop Mapping data](#) dataset builds on the 2014 and 2016 statewide crop mapping datasets DWR previously released and includes multi-cropping information. The 2018 dataset includes agricultural land use and urban boundaries for all 58 counties in California. Water year 2019 is planned to be released in 2022.
- [InSAR subsidence data](#) is now available [through October of 2020](#) and can be viewed on the [SGMA data viewer](#). The updated GIS services and data reports are also available [online](#). Future data will be released on a quarterly basis.

December 2021 DWR Updates (from DWR's North Central Region Office)

DWR Releases First and Second batches of GSP Assessments

On June 3rd, DWR released its first assessments of groundwater sustainability plans, which includes the approval of GSPs for the Santa Cruz Mid-County Basin and the 180/400-Foot Aquifer Subbasin. In addition, DWR also notified GSAs in the Cuyama Valley Basin and Paso Robles Subbasin that their GSPs lack specific details and are not yet approved. **On November 18th, 2021 the next round of assessments were released** including the approval of GSPs for the North and South Yuba Subbasins in Yuba County and the Oxnard Subbasin and Pleasant Valley Basin in Ventura County. In addition, DWR also notified groundwater sustainability agencies (GSAs) in the Eastern San Joaquin Subbasin, Merced Subbasin, Chowchilla Subbasin, and Westside Subbasin that their GSPs lack specific details and are not yet approved. **On December 9th**, DWR issued letters to communicate to the agencies representing the remaining six subbasins within the San Joaquin Valley Basin on the status of their groundwater sustainability plans, which contain deficiencies that will need to be addressed. These assessments and notification letters, along with other pertinent information, can be viewed [here on the DWR SGMA Portal](#).

Outreach and Educational Materials Available

DWR's [SGMA Assistance and Engagement webpage](#) has added new communication and engagement toolkit items including:

- A new video – [Groundwater: California's Vital Resource](#) now available in [English](#), [Spanish](#), [Punjabi](#), and [Hmong](#)
- A Story Map for a non-technical audience – [Groundwater: Understanding and Managing this Vital Resource](#)
- [Guidance on Engaging and Communicating with Underrepresented Groundwater Users](#)
- [SGMA Communications: Media Relations and Social Media](#), including [DWR's Groundwater Media Contacts](#)
- "DWR's Assistance Role in Groundwater Management" video: [English](#) and [Spanish](#)

CASGEM to Monitoring Network Module Transition Frequently Asked Questions Available

The [CASGEM to Monitoring Network Module Transition Frequently Asked Questions](#) (FAQ) document covers questions related to the Groundwater Monitoring Law, the California Statewide Groundwater Elevation Monitoring (CASGEM) Program, a GSP's required monitoring, the SGMA Portal's Monitoring Network Module (MNM), and a basin's or subbasin's transition from the CASGEM Online System to the SGMA Portal's Monitoring Network Module .

C2VSim Fine Grid Update Published April 2021

DWR has released an update to the Fine-Grid California Central Valley Groundwater-Surface Water Simulation (C2VSimFG) Model, which can be used by Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs) developing water budgets for their GSPs. [C2VSimFG Version 1.01](#) utilizes the latest version of the Integrated Water Flow Model software and corrects minor errors in the model files. These updates do not significantly affect the overall model calibration; however, resulting changes to simulated groundwater levels may vary by basin.

Facilitation Support Services (FSS): [Funding still available](#)

- GSA's developing GSPs are eligible to receive funding for identification and engagement of interested parties, meeting facilitation, interest-based negotiation/consensus building, and public outreach facilitation
- More information [can be found here](#). [New written translation services available in 10 languages for outreach materials \(5,000 word maximum\)](#).