BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WATER COMMITTEE

Monday, July 20, 2015 at 10:00 a.m.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
CONFERENCE ROOM

AGENDA

1. Discussion on Flood Management Activities – SJAFCA and Public Works
   a. Update on Delta Levee Investment Strategy
   b. Update on Cost-share Memorandum of Understanding with SJAFCA
   c. Public Comment Period for Smith Canal Gate Project Draft EIR

2. Discussion on Water Right Development, Resources Planning, and Other Activities – Public Works
   a. Update on Drought Activities
   b. Update on GBA Meeting of July 8, 2015 (See Attached)
   c. Update on Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) Discussions

Public Comments

Adjournment

Meeting Notice:

The next meeting is scheduled for August 24, 2015, at 10:00 a.m. at the Board of Supervisors Conference Room. Please send future agenda item requests to Brandon Nakagawa, bnakagawa@sjgov.org, or (209) 953-7460.
ATTACHMENT
2.b.
Pledge of Allegiance & Roll Call

Approval of Minutes for the Meeting of June 10, 2015

SCHEDULED ITEMS

A. Discussion Items

2. Update on the Request for Qualifications for On-call Geotechnical Services for Sustainable Groundwater Management Act Governance Discussions – Mike Callahan

B. Action Items:

1. Discussion and Possible Action to Support Assembly Bill 647 (Eggman) Groundwater Recharge as a Beneficial Use (See Attached) – Brandon Nakagawa
2. Discussion and Possible Action to Submit a Proposition 84 Integrated Regional Water Management Round 3 Implementation Grant Application to the California Department of Water Resources (See Attached) – Brandon Nakagawa
3. Discussion and Possible Action to Enter into an Agreement with GEI Consultants for the Preparation of the Round 3 Implementation Grant Application (See Attached) – Brandon Nakagawa

C. Communications/Articles/Announcements (See Attached):

1. June 10, 2015 Letter from the Department of Water Resources Designating San Joaquin County as the CASGEM Monitoring Entity.
2. June 19, 2015, Letter of Support for AB 647 (Eggman) Groundwater Recharge as a Beneficial Use from the Board of Supervisors to Senator Fran Pavely, Chair of the Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee.

Public Comment (Non-Agenda)

Next Regular Meeting: August 12, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

California Water Service Company, Conference Room
1602 East Lafayette Street, Stockton, California

Adjournment

Action may be taken on any item

Agendas and Minutes may also be found at http://www.gbwater.org

Note: If you need disability-related modification or accommodation in order to participate in this meeting, please contact San Joaquin County Public Works Water Resource Staff at (209) 468-3089 at least 48 hours prior to the start of the meeting.
Follow-up Items:
- Staff to bring the Regional Flood Management Plan, when adopted, to the Board for inclusion in the IRWMP
- Staff to agendize action to include the City of Stockton and Cal Water conservation projects in the IRWMP

Pledge: Chairperson Winn led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Roll Call:
The GBA Board Meeting was called to order at 9:35 a.m., on June 10, 2015, by Chairperson Chuck Winn at California Water Service Company, Conference Room, 1602 East Lafayette Street, Stockton. Also in attendance were Directors Elbert Holman, Jr., Mel Panizza, Reid Roberts, Tom Flinn, John Herrick, Stan Ferraro, Dale Kuil, Dante Nomellini, and Secretary Mike Selling. Roll was taken and a quorum was present.

Minutes:
Motion: A motion to approve the minutes for the meeting of May 13, 2015 was made by Director Panizza and seconded by Director Holman, Jr. The motion passed unanimously.

SCHEDULED ITEMS
A. Discussion Items:
1. Update on CASGEM Program Efforts – Michael Callahan
Mr. Callahan shared the good news that after several years of concerted effort, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) approved the San Joaquin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (District) as a California Statewide Groundwater Elevation Monitoring (CASGEM) Program Designated Monitoring Entity. Through the public outreach effort, permission was obtained from property owners to add over 100 wells to the program. Following submission of the new wells, DWR required an additional analysis of the vertical well coverage. Once this was provided, District staff received official approval. With that said, there are additional areas with sparse coverage and staff will seek adding wells in these areas as funding becomes available.

Chairman Winn asked if there is an immediate benefit for being designated a Monitoring Entity. Mr. Callahan responded that this designation is an eligibility requirement for Proposition 84 and Proposition 1 funding. Under the IRWMP 2014 Update, the GBA and local entities would be eligible to submit applications for local projects. Mr. Nakagawa added that the City of Lodi and Del Puerto Water District are both applying for DWR grants independently of the GBA and the countywide CASGEM designation allows each agency to meet eligibility criteria for grant funding. Both applications appear promising and Del Puerto would receive $1 Million in funding, should the grant be awarded.

Director Flinn asked if additional wells were needed in North San Joaquin. Mr. Callahan affirmatively responded and added that wells are also needed in the Delta, but not very
many are there because the focus of CASGEM is on groundwater that is of good enough quality to be usable.

B. Action Items:
1. Discussion and Possible Action to Adopt the Amended and Restated Joint Powers Agreement (See Attached) – Brandon Nakagawa

Mr. Nakagawa discussed two versions of the JPA, one in redline to track edits and another version with all edits accepted. He explained that the current JPA expires in June 2015 and approval of the Amended and Restated JPA would continue GBA efforts. As discussed in April, edits include expanding membership to South San Joaquin Irrigation District and extending an invitation to four others (the Cities of Lathrop, Lodi, Escalon and Manteca), which would provide comprehensive coverage of the basin, a key requirement under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) passed in 2014.

Additionally, language was added on Page 2 regarding utilizing the GBA as a convening forum as one strategy as SGMA is implemented. Language was clarified regarding hiring consultants in section 4.04 and stating County staff is also staff to GBA. Should Water Investigation Zone No. 2 funding be approved, there is some funding for GBA, which is stated in section 7.01. Mr. Nakagawa further explained that there was a new section, which would continue the GBA in perpetuity until there is agreement to dissolve and members may also opt out, but will forego the refund of paid dues for that fiscal year. Having a continuous GBA formation assists with DWR’s perception of a stable IRWMP governing body to implement the IRWMP 2014 Update and make grant applications as appropriate.

Director Kuil expressed concerned that in section 3.05, it appears that those agencies delinquent in their payment of membership dues would still be allowed to vote. Director Panizza agreed with Director Kuil, but also added that Districts vary in their ability to pay full dues. He suggested adjusting the dues amounts specifically for North San Joaquin Water Conservation District (NSJWCD) and Central San Joaquin Water Conservation District (CSJWCD). Both Directors further suggested that language in the JPA be amended to reflect a reduction in dues should it be determined that a district is limited in its ability to pay.

Mr. Nakagawa stated the issue could be addressed during budget discussions as a negotiating mechanism.

Both Directors Kuil and Panizza requested for the language to be amended in the JPA and not considered during the budget process. Chairman Winn stated that all points were well taken and it is important not to exclude any members from discussions. Comprehensive representation is needed. Director Nomellini suggested for the Directors to consider language in the JPA be added to reflect that should a member be delinquent in payment of dues, that member would not be allowed to vote until payment is received. Director Flinn mentioned that he appreciates the efforts of GBA staff to consider the ability of Districts to pay, but would like delinquency to be defined. Director Nomellini
suggested staff could come back to a future meeting to discuss options for defining delinquency. Director Ferraro inquired about whether payment installments would also be an option.

Motion: Adopt the Amended and Restated Joint Powers Agreement with amended language to reflect members delinquent in dues payment will not be permitted to vote in Board meetings.

Motion was moved, seconded and passed unanimously. (Nomellini/Kuil)

2. Discussion and Possible Action to Approve the Fiscal Year 2015-16 Budget (See Attached) – Brandon Nakagawa

Mr. Nakagawa presented the proposed GBA FY2015-16 budget for approval and noted the increased revenue from Zone No. 2, consultant contracts, one contract for GBA facilitation services and the decrease in revenue due to the completion of DWR grants.

Director Nomellini requested to change the budget to align with the JPA discussion. The suggestion was made by NSJWCD and CSJWCD to continue the lower membership dues at the 2014-15 levels, each at $1,000 annually.

Motion: Approve the Fiscal Year 2015-16 Budget, amended to reflect adjusted membership dues for NSJWCD and CSJWCD.

Motion was moved, seconded and passed unanimously. (Flinn/Kuil)

3. Discussion and Possible Action to Approve a No Additional Cost Term Extension to Agreement A-14-1 with Carlon Consulting (Carolyn Lott) for Facilitation and Strategic Advisory Services for Fiscal Year 2015-16 (See Attached) – Brandon Nakagawa

Mr. Nakagawa discussed the existing Agreement with Carlon Consulting for Carolyn Lott’s GBA facilitation services. The contract is set to expire on June 30, 2015. At this time, staff recommends the GBA approve a no additional cost term extension for the existing Agreement. The Carlon Consulting Agreement is funded for one year at $60,000. To-date expenditures total $7,000, therefore the balance ($53,000) is more than sufficient to cover costs for services in 2015-16. Additionally, DWR may fund facilitation services for SGMA, which may cover the cost of services provided by Ms. Lott. Should that occur, the GBA budget would reflect a cost savings.

Chairman Winn commented that he highly recommends the GBA support and application for facilitation services, specifically with Ms. Lott for the SGMA implementation process. He expressed it is critical for all members to participate to determine SGMA Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSA) and make it clear that it is not the intent of the County to wrestle control from agencies, but rather to support local control, coordinate efforts, minimize working at cross-purposes and achieve a comprehensive Groundwater
Sustainability Plan together and ensure SGMA compliance. Chairman Winn stated he strongly believes Ms. Lott is best suited to fill this facilitation role.

**Motion:** Approve a No Additional Cost Term Extension to Agreement A-14-1 with Carlon Consulting (Carolyn Lott) for Facilitation and Strategic Advisory Services for Fiscal Year 2015-16.

Motion was moved, seconded and passed unanimously. (Nomellini/Panizza)

4. Discussion and Possible Action to Direct Staff to Submit an Application to the California Department of Water Resources for Facilitation Services to Support Discussion Among Stakeholders for Sustainable Groundwater Act Management Implementation – Brandon Nakagawa

Mr. Nakagawa stated that DWR has streamlined the application process and the turnaround time should be minimal to get facilitation services in place. In the meantime, Ms. Lott will assist the GBA in its transition from discussing components of SGMA to understanding the timeline, roles/responsibilities, facilitating the discussion as agencies consider becoming GSAs, just to name a few areas. Chairman Winn would like the GBA to set a goal to determine GSAs by the end of the 2015 calendar year.

Director Nomellini added that the pressure point is coordination and all thinking at this state is preliminary. All agencies and the County need to consider the enforcement of groundwater extractions and the ability to local partners to regulate. This may not be a simple or swift process.

Chairman Winn added that no agency wants to lose its autonomy and the goal is to maintain local control while simultaneously achieving SGMA compliance. Discussions will need to occur between agencies, cities and other stakeholders.

**Motion:** Direct Staff to Submit an Application to the California Department of Water Resources for Facilitation Services to Support Discussion among Stakeholders for Sustainable Groundwater Act Management Implementation.

Motion was moved, seconded and passed unanimously. (Nomellini/Holman, Jr.)

C. Communications (See Attached):

   Full report available online: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/topics/groundwater/index.cfm.


Public Comment Non-Agenda:  Chairman Winn opened the public comment period. There were no public comments and the comment period was subsequently closed.

Adjournment:  The Chair adjourned the meeting at 10:25 a.m.

Next Regular Meeting:  July 8, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.
California Water Service Company, Conference Room
1602 East Lafayette Street, Stockton, California

Submitted by:
M. Lynn Hoffman, GBA Staff
Management Analyst III
Public Works Department
Water Resources Division
**MEETING ATTENDANCE RECORD**

**Meeting:**  GBA - BOARD MEETING  
**Location:**  CALIFORNIA WATER SERVICE COMPANY  
**Date:**  06/10/2015  
**Time:**  9:30 A.M.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
<th>E-MAIL ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Callahan</td>
<td>SJ CPW</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mjliu@live.com">mjliu@live.com</a></td>
<td>468-9360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy Lee</td>
<td>SEWD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:clee@send.net">clee@send.net</a></td>
<td>444-3119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Johnson</td>
<td>SEWD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mjohnson@sendmail.com">mjohnson@sendmail.com</a></td>
<td>948-0333</td>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>COS</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Regina.Rubler@stocktonc.com">Regina.Rubler@stocktonc.com</a></td>
<td>937-8782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Campbell</td>
<td>Delicato Family Winery</td>
<td><a href="mailto:christine.campbell@delicato.com">christine.campbell@delicato.com</a></td>
<td>824-3675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Jacob</td>
<td>CVUW/SCB</td>
<td><a href="mailto:christine.jacob@waterboards.co.gov">christine.jacob@waterboards.co.gov</a></td>
<td>415-4655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Poole</td>
<td>SEWD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:abrecht@recordnet.com">abrecht@recordnet.com</a></td>
<td>568-8275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Breither</td>
<td>The Record</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hwxward@envres.org">hwxward@envres.org</a></td>
<td>525-6710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Ward</td>
<td>Stan Co.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jason.pierce@water.ca">jason.pierce@water.ca</a></td>
<td>916-651-9636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Pierce</td>
<td>DWR</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jason.pierce@water.ca">jason.pierce@water.ca</a></td>
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<td>468-0315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Heberle</td>
<td>W.I.D.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hebelerlewis@gmail.com">hebelerlewis@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>625-8183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noel Callwell</td>
<td>ICSN, Inc.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ncallwell@icsninc.com">ncallwell@icsninc.com</a></td>
<td>946-0268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Zilles</td>
<td>Kleinfielder, Inc.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jzilles@kleinfielder.com">jzilles@kleinfielder.com</a></td>
<td>916-366-1701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Bologna</td>
<td>SSJID</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sbologna@ssj1id.com">sbologna@ssj1id.com</a></td>
<td>209-249-4617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lance Roberts</td>
<td>City of Lodi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lroberts@lodi.gov">lroberts@lodi.gov</a></td>
<td>625-7096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Richle</td>
<td>City of Lodi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:arichle@lodi.gov">arichle@lodi.gov</a></td>
<td>333-6878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFF SHAW</td>
<td>STANTEC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:JEFF.SHAW@STANTEC.COM">JEFF.SHAW@STANTEC.COM</a></td>
<td>916-524-3705</td>
</tr>
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<td>John Mohnen</td>
<td>STANTEC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:john.mohnen@stanc3te.com">john.mohnen@stanc3te.com</a></td>
<td>916-660-6683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>AFFILIATION</td>
<td>E-MAIL ADDRESS</td>
<td>PHONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td><a href="mailto:esisson@neumiller.com">esisson@neumiller.com</a></td>
<td>(209) 948-8200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtis Keller</td>
<td>NAB</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kkeller@neumiller.com">kkeller@neumiller.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Williamson</td>
<td>G &amp; I</td>
<td>mwilliamson@g&amp;i consultants.com</td>
<td>(209) 631-4859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zac Crawford</td>
<td>ENLEO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:zcrawford@engen.com">zcrawford@engen.com</a></td>
<td>(209) 684-7607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Lujig</td>
<td>ENGEO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rluig@engen.com">rluig@engen.com</a></td>
<td>(209) 684-7616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Gibson</td>
<td>City of Lathrop</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ggibson@ci.lathrop.ca">ggibson@ci.lathrop.ca</a></td>
<td>(209) 941-7447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando Ullon</td>
<td>City of Manteca</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fullora@ci.manteca">fullora@ci.manteca</a></td>
<td>(209) 456-8427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fritz Bachman</td>
<td>SJC - PW</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fbachman@sjcpw.org">fbachman@sjcpw.org</a></td>
<td>(209) 968-3107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerardo Design</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:gdemiguez@sjcpw.org">gdemiguez@sjcpw.org</a></td>
<td>(209) 955-7710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Hoffman</td>
<td>SJC - PW</td>
<td><a href="mailto:millhoffman@sjcpw.org">millhoffman@sjcpw.org</a></td>
<td>(209) 468-3531</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT
B.1.
July 8, 2015

Senator Fran Pavley
Chair, Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee
State Capitol Room 5046
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: AB 647 (Eggman) Beneficial use: storing of water underground – Support

Dear Chair Pavley,

On behalf of the Eastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Basin Authority (GBA), I am pleased to convey our support for Assembly Bill 647 (Eggman). Current law does not recognize groundwater recharge as a beneficial use despite it being a necessary tool for the purposes of protecting groundwater quality, preventing land subsidence, and providing crucial dry-period water supplies through groundwater storage. All of these things can be accomplished under AB 647 while still leaving groundwater recharge for storage purposes effectively under the jurisdiction of the State Water Resources Control Board until its ultimate beneficial use. With only minor absorbable costs to the State, AB 647 will confirm into law what most Californians already know: groundwater recharge is not only a beneficial use of water, but a critical component to meeting the requirements set forth in the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act of 2014.

For the reasons stated, the Eastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Basin Authority is pleased to support AB 647 and respectfully requests your yea vote when this bill is heard before your committee on July 14, 2015.

Sincerely,

CHUCK WINN
Chairman
Eastern San Joaquin County
Groundwater Basin Authority

c: The Honorable Susan Eggman
Honorable Members, Assembly Appropriations Committee
Eastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Basin Authority
Paul J. Yoder, Shaw / Yoder / Antwih, Inc.
ATTACHMENT

B.2.
WHEREAS, the primary goal of the Eastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Basin Authority (GBA) is to develop locally-supported groundwater projects that improve water supply reliability in Eastern San Joaquin County and to provide benefits to project participants and San Joaquin County as a whole; and,

WHEREAS, the Eastern San Joaquin Region is recognized by the State Department of Water Resources (DWR) and is eligible to develop an Integrated Regional Water Management Plan pursuant to DWR established guidelines; and,

WHEREAS, on June 11, 2014, the Board of Directors of the GBA adopted the Eastern San Joaquin Integrated Regional Water Management Plan 2014 Update; and,

WHEREAS, up to $6.7 Million is anticipated to be available from Proposition 84 for the San Joaquin River Funding Area for the Integrated Regional Water Management Drought Round 3 Implementation Grant Solicitation with a 25% minimum funding match. For projects that address a critical water supply or water quality need for a disadvantaged community, the funding match may be waived; and,

WHEREAS, the projects to be submitted in the Integrated Regional Water Management Round 3 Grant Proposal are consistent with the adopted Eastern San Joaquin Integrated Regional Water Management Plan 2014 Update.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that this Board of Directors of the Eastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Basin Authority hereby:

1. Authorizes and directs Staff to submit an Integrated Regional Water Management Round 3 Implementation Grant Proposal to the California Department of Water Resources funded by the Safe Drinking Water, Water Quality and Supply, Flood Control, River and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2006 (Public Resource Code Section 75001 et seq); and,

2. Authorizes Staff to prepare the necessary data, conduct investigations, file such application and authorizes the Chairman to execute and enter into an agreement to receive a grant with the Department of Water Resources upon award of grant funds, provided required cost share sources have been secured.
RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING SUBMITTAL
IRWM ROUND 3 IMPLEMENTATION GRANT PROPOSAL

PASSED AND ADOPTED this June 8, 2014, by the following vote of the Board of Directors, to wit:

AYES:
I
NOES:
ABSENT:

ATTEST: MIKE SELLING
Interim Secretary of the
Eastern San Joaquin County
Groundwater Basin Authority

CHUCK WINN, Chairman
Board of Directors of the
Eastern San Joaquin County
Groundwater Basin Authority
October 2, 2014

Mr. Zaffar Eusuff
California Department of Water Resources
Division of Integrated Regional Water Management
Financial Assistance Branch
Post Office Box 942836
Sacramento, California 94236

SUBJECT: REQUEST TO RECONSIDER SCORING AND DISQUALIFICATION
PROPOSITION 84 DROUGHT 2014 GRANT SOLICITATION

Dear Mr. Eusuff:

The Eastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Basin Authority wishes to protest the scoring and disqualification of its Proposition 84 2014 Drought Grant application.

The San Joaquin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (District) filed to become a designated California Statewide Groundwater Elevation Monitoring (CASGEM) entity in 2010. Subsequently, the District has had extensive interactions with the Department of Water Resources’ (DWR) staff to conform the District's 400+ well monitoring program to the evolving CASGEM standards. During Roundtable of Regions conference calls, DWR staff indicated that the Eastern San Joaquin Region application would be considered, providing progress was being made to become a CASGEM designated agency prior to application submittal. Contrary to this conversation, the application was disqualified due to California Statewide Groundwater Elevation Monitoring non-compliance. The District is requesting that DWR consider reversing this decision, as well as reconsider the draft scoring.

There appears to be inconsistencies and possible oversights in the scoring that resulted in an overall lower score. The San Joaquin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District's analysis, which includes the draft scoring and requested adjustments, is attached.

If you would like to discuss these issues further, please contact me at (209) 953-7460.

Sincerely,

BRANDON W. NAKAGAWA
Water Resources Coordinator

Attachment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Points Available</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
<th>Rebuttal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1. Does the Proposal clearly demonstrate the regional water management impact(s) due to the 2014 drought or any anticipated impacts if the drought or dry year conditions continue into 2015?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Six drought-related impacts are described in Attachment 2: Risk of not meeting drinking water demands; Risk of not meeting agricultural water demands; Resumption of historical Groundwater basin overdraft; Increased crop water demands; Saline water migration; and Surface water curtailments. Surface water deliveries have been reduced, mandatory rationing is required, and additional groundwater is being pumped from the historically overdrafted groundwater basin. If the drought continues into 2015, additional surface water curtailments are expected. Voluntary and mandatory water conservation efforts are described. The Region will experience at least four of the impacts listed on p.28 of the PSP -- this is a &quot;High&quot; drought impact according to the table on p.28 and should have been awarded 4 points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12 Are the anticipated primary and secondary physical benefits of the project described and quantified?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Two or more physical benefits are described and quantified for all projects. Three benefits are quantified for Project 1 (Tables 5.1a, 5.1b, 5.1c). Two benefits are described and quantified for Project 2 (Tables 5.2a, 5.2b). Two benefits are described and quantified for Project 3 (Tables 5.3a, 5.3b). Credit is given only for Project 4, which provides the same benefits and quantification methods as Projects 1, 2, and 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14 Does the technical analysis support the claimed benefits?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Project 2, a tailwater reuse project, is modeled on a similar District project that has been in operation for the last 2 years -- the water and energy savings performance is expected to be proportionally the same as this existing project -- this is clearly stated in Attachment 3 (1 of 8) and documented in Attachment 3 (3 of 8) and Attachment 3 (4 of 8). Project 3 (an on-farm water conservation program) is a continuation of an existing successful program -- the continued benefits are expected to be similar to the existing program -- the performance of the existing program is clearly stated in Attachment 3 (1 of 8) and documented in Attachment 3 (6 of 8, 7 of 8, and 8 of 8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16 Does the applicant discuss the necessary tasks that will result in a completed project?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>A complete listing of tasks, a description of work to be performed, and deliverables is provided for each project within the page limitation provided. The DWR-requested work summary was explicitly not to include a lengthy explanation of the project. The identically formatted summary for Project 4 was found acceptable by reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Points Available</td>
<td>Points Awarded</td>
<td>Rebuttal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.17 Do the tasks included in the scope of work include appropriate deliverables?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75 points -- No credit given of Project 4</td>
<td>A complete listing of tasks, a description of work to be performed, and deliverables is provided for each project within the page limitation provided. Deliverables for Project 4 are identified in a tabular format similar to the other three projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.21 Are the costs presented in the Budget reasonable for the project type and the current stage of the project?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5 points -- No credit given of Projects 2, 3</td>
<td>Costs presented in Attachment 5 for Projects 2 &amp; 3 are based on contractor construction estimates. These detailed estimates were not requested by DWR, but were offered to DWR if tentatively awarded grant funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.23 Does the schedule demonstrate that it is reasonable to expect the project will start construction/implementation by April 1, 2015?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75 points -- No credit given of Project 3</td>
<td>Task 10.3 of Attachment 6 (Schedule) for Project 3 clearly indicates that installation of the project will start by December 31, 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.24 Does the application describe the steps necessary to ensure the proposed schedule can be met?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25 point - No credit given to Projects 1, 2, 3</td>
<td>A discussion of the reasonableness of the schedule for each project is provided in Attachment 6. Project 1 is based on a contractor contract and confirmed availability of City resources. Project 2 is based on the experience for constructing a very similar project two years ago. Project 3 is based on an existing program that was suspended for lack of funding — the project implementation can be resumed immediately upon funding becoming available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL REQUESTED ADDITIONAL POINTS**  
7.25

**CURRENT SCORE**  
25.75

**REVISED SCORE**  
33

* Submitting agency is misidentified as "Northeastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Banking Authority" in the draft DWR grant score sheet.
ATTACHMENT

B.3.
July 1, 2015

Mr. Brandon Nakagawa, Water Resources Coordinator  
San Joaquin County Department of Public Works  
1810 E. Hazelton Ave  
Stockton, CA 95201  
Transmitted via e-mail bnakagawa@sjgov.org

Subject: Proposal for 2015 Proposition 84 IRWM Implementation Grant Assistance

Mr. Nakagawa:

GEI Consultants is pleased to present this proposal to provide grant preparation services to the Eastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Basin Authority (GBA). GEI has been very successful in securing over $200 million in grant funding for our clients. We have been assisting the GBA in IRWM Plan preparation, the Region Acceptance Process, and grant fund acquisition. GEI also assembled the 2014 Proposition 84 drought grant application on behalf of the GBA. While the 2014 application was not successful, some of the included projects are candidates for inclusion and can be efficiently incorporated in the 2015 application.

Based on the discussion at the June 10th GBA Coordinating Committee meeting, it is our understanding that the GBA is considering pursuing a 2015 Proposition 84 IRWM Implementation Grant for up to four projects. This final Proposition 84 Grant round will award the $6.7 million remaining for the San Joaquin Funding Area. This Funding Area is the most competitive in the state, with 13 IRWM Regions potentially competing for the available funds.

Grant applications are due August 7th, and must fully describe the projects, their cost and status, an analysis of benefits and the work effort that will result in a new or revised IRWM Plan. It is our understanding that project proponents will be available to assist in developing these elements. Project proponents have the best understanding of the projects, their costs, completed background studies, and the array of benefits the projects will provide. Assistance from the project proponents will be key to successful grant acquisition.

GEI’s proposed services include coordinating with GBA staff and project proponents, consulting with and advising GBA on appropriate grant strategies, and leading the Planning Grant application and submittal process. We have assumed that GBA staff will be available to assist and facilitate this effort.
We have reviewed the DWR grant Project Solicitation Package (PSP) and have prepared the attached level of effort estimate. GEI proposes to provide approximately 220 hours over the five week application period. At our current billing rates (attached) with nominal allowance (not to exceed $500) for expenses, this work will be accomplished for a fee of $40,000 on a time and materials basis. We will work as efficiently as possible to keep charges to the minimum. The number of projects and the degree of assistance from project proponents can also reduce costs.

The work will be performed by Mark Williamson or under his direct supervision. Mark will be assisted by experienced staff grant writers Jon Goetz, David Miller, Melissa Cansdale, and support staff as needed. Allowances have been provided for meetings and coordination with GBA staff and membership, and attendance of relevant DWR meetings.

Please call me at 916/631-4559 if I can provide any additional information.

Respectfully submitted,

GEI CONSULTANTS, INC.

Mark S. Williamson P.E.
Vice President

Attachments
### Estimated Level of GEI Effort

**2015 GBA Prop84 IRWM Grant Writing Assistance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grade 8</th>
<th>Grade 6</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Admin</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Williamson Goetz GIS Cansdale Rate:</td>
<td>$253</td>
<td>$190</td>
<td>$167</td>
<td>$126</td>
<td>$94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Hours:</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Cost:</td>
<td>$15,180</td>
<td>$11,400</td>
<td>$2,004</td>
<td>$10,080</td>
<td>$1,128</td>
<td>$39,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Cost:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FEE SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Category</th>
<th>Hourly Billing Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Professional – Grade 1</td>
<td>$ 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Professional – Grade 2</td>
<td>$ 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Professional – Grade 3</td>
<td>$ 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Professional – Grade 4</td>
<td>$ 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Professional – Grade 5</td>
<td>$ 167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Professional – Grade 6</td>
<td>$ 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Professional – Grade 7</td>
<td>$ 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Consultant – Grade 8</td>
<td>$ 253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Consultant – Grade 9</td>
<td>$ 312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Principal – Grade 10</td>
<td>$ 312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior CADD Drafter and Designer</td>
<td>$ 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CADD Drafter / Designer and Senior Technician</td>
<td>$ 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technician, Word Processor, Administrative Staff</td>
<td>$ 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Aide</td>
<td>$ 73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These rates are billed for both regular and overtime hours in all categories.
Rates will increase up to 5% annually, at GEI’s option, for all contracts that extend beyond twelve (12) months after the date of the contract. Rates for Deposition and Testimony are increased 1.5 times.

OTHER PROJECT COSTS

Subconsultants, Subcontractors and Other Project Expenses - All costs for subconsultants, subcontractors and other project expenses will be billed at cost plus a 15% service charge. Examples of such expenses ordinarily charged to projects are subconsultants; subconsultants: chemical laboratory charges; rented or leased field and laboratory equipment; outside printing and reproduction; communications and mailing charges; reproduction expenses; shipping costs for samples and equipment; disposal of samples; rental vehicles; fares for travel on public carriers; special fees for insurance certificates, permits, licenses, etc.; fees for restoration of paving or land due to field exploration, etc.; state sales and use taxes and state taxes on GEI fees.

Billing Rates for Specialized Technical Computer Programs – Computer usage for specialized technical programs will be billed at a flat rate of $10.00 per hour in addition to the labor required to operate the computer.

Field and Laboratory Equipment Billing Rates – GEI-owned field and laboratory equipment such as pumps, sampling equipment, monitoring instrumentation, field density equipment, portable gas chromatographs, etc. will be billed at a daily, weekly, or monthly rate, as needed for the project. Expendable supplies are billed at a unit rate.

Transportation and Subsistence - Automobile expenses for GEI or employee owned cars will be charged at the rate per mile set by the Internal Revenue Service for tax purposes plus tolls and parking charges or at a day rate negotiated for each project. When required for a project, four-wheel drive vehicles owned by GEI or the employees will be billed at a daily rate appropriate for those vehicles. Per diem living costs for personnel on assignment away from their home office will be negotiated for each project.

PAYMENT TERMS

Invoices will be submitted monthly or upon completion of a specified scope of service, as described in the accompanying contract (proposal, project, or agreement document that is signed and dated by GEI and CLIENT).

Payment is due upon receipt of the invoice. Interest will accrue at the rate of 1% of the invoice amount per month, for amounts that remain unpaid more than 30 days after the invoice date. All payments will be made by either check or electronic transfer to the address specified by GEI and will include reference to GEI’s invoice number.
ATTACHMENT
C.1.
June 10, 2015

Mr. Brandon W. Nakagawa, P.E.
Water Resources Manager
San Joaquin County Public Works Department
Post Office Box 1810
Stockton, California 95201

Monitoring Entity Designation for San Joaquin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District under the California Statewide Groundwater Elevation Monitoring Program

Dear Mr. Nakagawa:

Thank you for volunteering to be a Monitoring Entity for the California Statewide Groundwater Elevation Monitoring (CASGEM) program. On December 30, 2010, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) received your notification that San Joaquin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District intends to assume responsibility for monitoring and reporting local groundwater elevations for the CASGEM program. Based on review and verification of the information that you submitted to DWR via the CASGEM Online Submittal System, San Joaquin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District is designated as the Monitoring Entity for the following groundwater subbasins:

- Eastern San Joaquin (5-22.01) San Joaquin County portion
- Tracy (5-22.15) San Joaquin County portion
- Cosumnes (5-22.16) San Joaquin County portion

The CASGEM Online System is ready to accept submittal of your groundwater elevation data. In accordance with the Water Code, you should submit groundwater elevation data for the wells you have included in the CASGEM program, beginning with data collected in fall 2011.

Additional information is available on the CASGEM program website at http://www.water.ca.gov/groundwater/casgem.
If you have any questions about the CASGEM program, please contact Bill Brewster in DWR's North Central Region Office at 3500 Industrial Boulevard, West Sacramento, California 95691, (916) 376-9657, or bill.brewster@water.ca.gov.

Thank you for your participation in the CASGEM program.

Sincerely,

Paula J. Landis, Chief
Division of Integrated Regional Water Management

cc: Bill Brewster, North Central Region Office
    Brett Wyckoff, Bonderson Bldg. Rm. 213 A

Gerardo Dominguez
Associate Engineer
San Joaquin County Public Works Department
Water Resource Division
Post Office Box 1810
Stockton, California 95201
ATTACHMENT
C.2.
June 19, 2015

Senator Fran Pavley  
Chair, Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee  
State Capitol Room 5046  
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: AB 647 (Eggman) Beneficial use: storing of water underground – Support

Dear Chair Pavley,

On behalf of the San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors, I am pleased to convey our support for Assembly Bill 647 (Eggman). Current law does not recognize groundwater recharge as a beneficial use despite it being a necessary tool for the purposes of protecting groundwater quality, preventing land subsidence, and providing crucial dry-period water supplies through groundwater storage. All of these things can be accomplished under AB 647 while still leaving groundwater recharge for storage purposes effectively under the jurisdiction of the State Water Resources Control Board until its ultimate beneficial use. With only minor absorbable costs to the State, AB 647 will confirm into law what most Californians already know: groundwater recharge is not only a beneficial use of water, but a critical component to meeting the requirements set forth in the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act of 2014.

For the reasons stated, the San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors is pleased to support AB 647 and respectfully requests your aye vote when this bill is heard before your committee on July 14, 2015.

Sincerely,

Katherine M. Miller, Chair  
San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors

cc: The Honorable Susan Eggman  
Honorable Members, Assembly Appropriations Committee  
San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors  
Paul J. Yoder, Shaw / Yoder / Antwih, Inc.
1. Applicant Contact Information

Name: Brandon Nakagawa
Affiliation: Eastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Basin Authority (GBA)
Mailing Address: PO Box 1810 Stockton, CA 95201
Email: bnakagawa@sjgov.org
Telephone: 209-468-3089

2. Participant Stakeholder Organization(s):

GBA Member Agencies: San Joaquin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, City of Stockton, California Water Service Company – Stockton, City of Lodi, Stockton-East Water District, Central San Joaquin Water Conservation District, Woodbridge Irrigation District, North San Joaquin Water Conservation District, City of Manteca, City of Lathrop, City of Ripon, City of Escalon, South San Joaquin Irrigation District, Central Delta Water Agency, South Delta Water Agency, and the San Joaquin Farm Bureau Federation (Associate Member).

Invitees Overlying Cosumnes and Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Sub-basins: Stanislaus County, Oakdale Irrigation District, Calaveras County Water District, Calaveras County, Stakeholders in the Cosumnes Sub-basin, and Sacramento County.

San Joaquin County Government Participants: County Administrator, County Counsel, Environmental Health, Community Development, Agricultural Commissioner, and Public Works.

3. Please identify the geographical area to receive requested facilitation support services. The area may be described using IRWM region boundaries, groundwater basin or subbasin boundaries, etc. Please attach map(s) if available.
Facilitation would be primarily focused on the San Joaquin County portion of the Eastern San Joaquin and Cosumnes Groundwater Sub basins with the intent to expand the focus to include the sub-basin areas outside of San Joaquin County.

See attached maps:

IRWM Regional Planning Area (GBA IRWMP 2014 Update – Figure 4-12)
- Defined as that portion of the San Joaquin County that overlies the Eastern San Joaquin and Cosumnes Groundwater Sub-basins

DWR Groundwater Sub-basins (GBA IRWMP 2014 Update – Figure 2-4)
- Eastern San Joaquin 5.22.1
- Cosumnes 5-22.16

Groundwater Sub-basins of San Joaquin County (GBA IRWMP 2014 Update – Figure 4-7)
Disadvantaged Community Census Blocks (GBA IRWMP 2014 Update – Figure 5-1)

4. Please select the most appropriate Integrated Water Management (IWM) planning objective from the list below:

- [x] Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP)
- [ ] Groundwater Management Plan (GWMP) (*Low or Very Low Priority Basins only)
- [ ] IRWM Plan/Plan Improvement
- [ ] Other

If “Other,” please explain:

* = Not applicable for High or Medium Priority Basins

5. Please select the status description (most appropriate) for the IWM objective identified above.

- [x] Group Formation (e.g., GSA, IRWM Group)
- [x] Initial Plan Development
- [ ] Plan Improvement
- [ ] Other

If “Other,” please explain:
6. Please describe measures (including signed agreement(s)) that have been/will be taken to ensure that the planning process supported by the requested facilitation services will be open and inclusive. Recognizing that an applicant may not be able to identify all interests and beneficial users of groundwater within their basin or subbasin prior to the beginning of facilitation services, please describe all efforts to date and signify your intent and commitment that the facilitated process will be open and inclusive. [NOTE: For efforts focused on compliance with the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act of 2014, applicants should address California Water Code sections 10723.2, “Consideration of all interests of all beneficial uses and users of groundwater,” and 10723.4, “Maintenance of an Interested Person List.”] If seeking stakeholder assessment, please skip.

The GBA was formed in 2001 as a joint powers authority which strives to reach consensus and speak with one voice on behalf of its member agencies. Using the current list of contacts developed from the GBA’s 2007 and 2014 IRWM processes and also the GBA’s Disadvantaged Community Contact list, the GBA will seek to notify these contacts of the facilitated discussions convened by the GBA. Additional contacts may need to be identified and contacted (i.e. small public water systems, water districts/maintenance districts, non-governmental organizations) In addition, the GBA will reach out to entities as described in Water Code Section 10723.2 within the Cosumnes and Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Sub-basins. The list of contacts will be managed by the GBA in accordance with Water Code Section 10723.4.

7. Please identify the facilitation support service(s) requested. Check all that apply.

**Stakeholder Identification and Outreach**
- [x] Assist with the identification of stakeholders;
- [x] Develop stakeholder information materials (such as pamphlets, press releases, and surveys) as a means to inform the public and various groups about prospective planning efforts and how stakeholders can become involved; and
- [x] Conduct forums to inform stakeholders about prospective planning efforts and encourage involvement.

**Stakeholder Assessment**
- [x] Identify stakeholder interests and concerns through discussions with individual stakeholders;
- [x] Analyze and document stakeholder input, interests, and concerns;
- [x] Develop plans to further engage stakeholders and encourage meaningful involvement in planning efforts;
- [x] Assist stakeholder groups to identify and develop common planning goals and objectives; and
- [x] Help stakeholder groups establish an appropriate governance system.
Stakeholder Liaison Services

☑ Improve stakeholder understanding and interest through ongoing individual or collective engagement of stakeholders (emphasis on collective); and

☑ Help resolve disputes and other possible impediments to continued participation in planning efforts through ongoing individual or collective engagement of stakeholders (emphasis on collective).

Meeting Facilitation Support

☑ Set meeting agendas and goals;
☑ Develop attendance requests/invitation lists;
☑ Design meeting processes;
☑ Identify and brief speakers and key participants;
☑ Monitor and control meeting schedules;
☑ Stimulate group discussions and processes;
☑ Encourage participation by individuals;
☑ Prevent speaker domination;
☑ Prevent excessive side-tracking of discussions;
☑ Foster discussion of differing points of view;
☑ Promote collaborative methods for stakeholders to discuss and analyze topics;
☑ Mediate conflicts and support group discussions toward consensus, when appropriate; and
☑ Prepare and review documentation of meeting discussions, conclusions, agreements, action items, assignments, and unresolved issues.

8. Please explain how the requested facilitation support services will build toward the development, improvement, or implementation of a clear and defined IWM objective (e.g., GSP, GWMP, IRWM Plan, GSA formation).
The GBA has developed and updated an IRWMP for Eastern San Joaquin County with the assistance of Proposition 50 and 84 funds. Many of the elements of the IRWMP both in the 2007 and the 2014 iterations centered on a number of conjunctive use projects and programs. Complying with SGMA will require a long hard look at governance and ultimately looking at how projects in the IRWMP can be phased, financed and implemented to achieve sustainability for the underlying groundwater basin. The enforceability of GSPs will require a governance structure that is robust enough to deal with difficult decisions that may come before stakeholders. Facilitation is envisioned to help continue to build upon the consensus building efforts of the GBA as well as the IRWMP work that has been done to date for Eastern San Joaquin County and the MokeWISE Program in order to develop a durable and acceptable local governance structure for compliance with the SGMA.

Additionally, the GBA’s co-sponsoring of the Mokelumne Watershed Interregional Sustainability Evaluation (MokeWISE) Program with the Mokelumne-Amador-Calaveras IRWM Region has greatly improved the GBA’s understanding of the values of other stakeholders on the Mokelumne River both in the Lower and Upper Watershed reaches. Of particular interest is developing additional opportunities for an inter-regional conjunctive use project that could potentially benefit both the GBA and MAC Regions while being respectful of the environmental, recreational, and aesthetic values of the Mokelumne Watershed. The MokeWISE Program is funded through a Prop 84 IRWM Planning Grant. The MokeWISE process has been an excellent primer for cooperation across political boundaries within the complex Mokelumne Watershed in preparation for the future challenge of coordination of groundwater management across multiple groundwater sub-basins.

9. Please identify the reason(s) that facilitation services should be provided by DWR’s Facilitation Support Services program versus through a participating local agency/organization. (Check all that apply.)

☑ Neutral facilitation to coordinate diverse stakeholders within your planning area
☑ Neutral mediation to address existing and/or emerging conflict(s) within your planning area
☑ Capacity building (e.g. the desire to help stakeholders in the planning area to build collaborative skills and become more self-sufficient over time)
☑ Lack of capacity (e.g., personnel, skill level required, funding, etc.).
☑ Other

If “Other,” please explain:

During the development of the language of SGMA, there was a clear back and forth between local land use agencies (cities and counties) and special districts (water districts and irrigation districts) as to who would be best suited for governance. Having facilitation amongst the GBA group is important because the mix of cities, water/irrigation districts, and San Joaquin County will require an equitable opportunity to participate for all involved in order for the GBA members and invitees to come to consensus on the governance structure for SGMA compliance. It is entirely possible that multiple GSA’s may emerge from the process.
10. Please summarize anticipated milestones to be achieved as a result of the requested services, along with projected dates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone(s)</th>
<th>Projected Date(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance Assessment – Inventory of existing governance structures and</td>
<td>Summer 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authorities as related to SGMA prescribed authorities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance Framework – GSA models</td>
<td>Summer 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus on, “Who will be the Designated Sustainable Groundwater Management</td>
<td>January 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency(ies)?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder and Outreach Plan</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies File for GSA Designation per SGMA</td>
<td>Prior to June 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin Drafting GSP (as guidelines become available from DWR)</td>
<td>January 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater Sustainability Plan Adopted</td>
<td>January 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. What specific efforts, facilities, materials, and resources are required to support the requested facilitation services, and who (applicant or participating agency/organization) will provide the support?

The GBA is prepared to provide staff support to agendize meetings (two stakeholder meetings per month) and comply with the Brown Act, as well as provide a venue for the facilitated discussions. The GBA has within its annual budget the ability to provide technical support through consultants and technical staff to assist in the discussion (Request for Qualifications is currently being drafted and is scheduled to be released in July), printed material and postage. Additionally, the GBA website at, www.GBAWater.org, will be available to post meeting materials, presentations, and documents for stakeholders.

12. Please cite and explain any preference for a particular facilitator.

Carolyn Lott has been the GBA’s facilitator since its inception in 2001. The GBA respectfully requests that Ms. Lott continue to be the facilitator for the GBA through the SGMA discussion. Ms. Lott is uniquely familiar with the GBA and its stakeholders as well as being well respected for her skills in building consensus and also as a former elected official in local government. Additionally, Ms. Lott is currently under contract with the GBA to provide strategic advisory services on issues regarding IRWM strategies and has helped immensely to facilitate the early discussions on SGMA.
13. List of attachments (e.g., map(s), agreement(s))

IRWM Regional Planning Area (GBA IRWMP 2014 Update – Figure 4-12)
DWR Groundwater Sub-basins (GBA IRWMP 2014 Update – Figure 2-4)
Groundwater Sub-basins of San Joaquin County (GBA IRWMP 2014 Update – Figure 4-7)
Disadvantaged Community Census Blocks (GBA IRWMP 2014 Update – Figure 5-1)
GBA Joint Powers Agreement (Adopted June 10, 2015 and in the process of being fully executed by member agencies)

14. DWR Service Representative (SR), DWR Region Office

Hong Lin, North Central

15. Applicant signature:

Brandon W. Nakagawa  
June 19, 2015
Water Resources Coordinator
Eastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Basin Authority
San Joaquin County, California
Figure 2-4 - DWR Groundwater Basins in San Joaquin River Hydrologic Region
Figure 4-7 Groundwater Sub-Basins of San Joaquin County

Source: California Spatial Information Library at http://www.gis.ca.gov/
Figure 5-1 Map Disadvantaged Census Blocks

Source: 2010 Census Data