



NORTHEASTERN SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY GROUNDWATER BANKING AUTHORITY

1810 EAST HAZELTON AVENUE
STOCKTON, CALIFORNIA 95205
(209) 468-3531
(209) 468-2999/FAX

KEN VOGEL
CHAIRMAN

THOMAS M. GAU
SECRETARY

Board of Directors Meeting AGENDA

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

Wednesday, June 8, 2011
9:30 a.m.

GBA MEMBERS
CALIFORNIA WATER SERVICE COMPANY
CENTRAL DELTA WATER AGENCY
CENTRAL SAN JOAQUIN
WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT
CITY OF LODI
CITY OF STOCKTON
NORTH SAN JOAQUIN
WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT
STOCKTON EAST WATER DISTRICT
SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY
SOUTH DELTA WATER AGENCY
WOODBRIDGE IRRIGATION DISTRICT
SAN JOAQUIN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION
ASSOCIATE MEMBER

Pledge of Allegiance & Roll Call

Approval of Minutes for the Meeting of March 9, 2011

SCHEDULED ITEMS

A. Discussion Items:

1. Update on Proposition 84 IRWM Project Grant Application Submittal (See Attached) – Mel Lytle/Brandon Nakagawa

B. Action Items:

1. Discussion and Possible Action on Recommendation to Extend GBA JPA Agreement through December 31, 2011 (See Attached) – Mel Lytle
2. Discussion and Possible Action on Approval of FY 2011-12 Annual Budget – Mel Lytle
3. Discussion and Possible Action on Amendment to GEI/Bookman-Edmonston Agreement for Consulting Services (See Attached) – Brandon Nakagawa
4. Discussion and Possible Action on Amendment to Center for Collaborative Policy Agreement for Facilitation Services (See Attached) – Brandon Nakagawa
5. Discussion and Possible Action to Approve the Request for Proposals Release for the Eastern San Joaquin Integrated Regional Water Management Plan Update (See Attached) – Brandon Nakagawa

C. Communications (See Attached):

1. ACWA Groundwater Management in California Framework Fact Sheet

Public Comment (Non-Agenda)

Next Regular Meeting: **July, 13 2011, 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.gbawater.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.

**Northeastern San Joaquin Groundwater Banking Authority
Board Meeting Summary
Wednesday, March 9, 2011**

Roll Call:

The GBA Board meeting was called to order at 9:34 a.m. by Vice Chair Katherine Miller March 9, 2010 at the California Water Service Company Conference Room, 1602 East Lafayette Street, Stockton. Director Nomellini led the Pledge of Allegiance. Also in attendance were Directors Stan Ferraro, John Herrick, Dante Nomellini, Mel Panizza, Reid Roberts, Hugh Scanlon, and Secretary Tom Gau. Role was taken and a quorum was present.

Minutes:

A motion to approve the minutes for the meeting of February 9, 2011 was made by Director Panizza and seconded by Director Herrick. The motion passed unanimously.

Follow-up Items:

- Dr. Lytle to schedule subcommittee meetings for the GBA agreement
- Dr. Lytle to arrange presentation on LLL study on Morada Basin

SCHEDULED ITEMS

A. Discussion Items:

1. Presentation on Fall 2010 Groundwater Basin Conditions Report (See Attached) – Gerardo Dominguez/Brandon Nakagawa

Mr. Dominguez presented the "Semi-Annual Groundwater Monitoring Program" report. There are approximately 400 wells monitored through this program in San Joaquin County. Data is incorporated from numerous monitoring sources including the county, Cal Water, and DWR.

This is the second groundwater quality monitoring effort by the county. Because it was a wet year, all constituents decreased. Electrical conductivity, chloride, and total dissolved solids were measured and depicted in several graphs.

While 2010 was a good wet year, groundwater elevations dropped slightly in the Northern San Joaquin Water Conservation District (NSJWCD). In other areas, the groundwater level increased as compared to 2009. Out of 127 wells measured within the NSJWCD, 102 dropped approximately 1 foot. This is at least partially due to lack of use of surface water to supplement the groundwater supply. Where the major depression exists within the district, it still measures at minus 60 feet.

The cross-section along the Highway 99 alignment shows gains until approximately Eight Mile Road where it decreases. The level gains again near Turner and then decreases again at Palteir Lane. Moving further east, depth to ground water continues to drop. All the data is available at www.sjwater.org.

Director Nomellini asked about water quality at the jail site. Staff said it shows an increase in salts at the site. There are theories that gas wells located in the area may be contributing to this problem.

Director Herrick said it now should be possible to calculate how much rain needs to fall to hold NSJWCD at a constant average groundwater level. Staff stated it is more complicated as it is not just the quantity of rain, but also when the rain comes and in what duration. In addition the amount of pumping affects groundwater levels, as well.

Mr. Ross Moilan asked if there is the same level of natural recharge in NSJWCD as exists in other areas of the county. Mr. Nakagawa said the area is very sandy and it depends on rainfall to recharge the aquifer. He added more accurate information will be available when the spring monitoring is factored into the report. It is possible the district may have more recharge from late season rainfall. The numbers in the current report are from the fall and perhaps there was some irrigation being done at that time

Director Panizza clarified what is being compared in NSJWCD is a compilation of fall and spring of 2009, in addition to a moderate summer, so there should have been a relatively similar increase. Dr. Lytle said one thing that is known is the district is not supplementing with surface water. If you look at the City of Stockton and Cal Water, for example, there have been continued efforts to supplement their supply with more surface water and therefore groundwater levels have improved.

Director Ferraro asked if there has been an analysis of pumping patterns as this will also affect water levels. He added it would be helpful to be able to look at pumping levels as they relate to water levels. Mr. Nakagawa said that it is very data intensive to get so a surrogate of crops is used considering factors such as planting intensity, type of crop, etc. This is necessary as staff is not privy to pumping quantities for private wells.

Director Panizza said he believes there is more "municipal" type use of well water in NSJWCD than in some other areas.

Director Scanlon commented he believes there is a different aquifer under NSJWCD that is part of the Consumnes Basin versus the San Joaquin Basin, so perhaps data needs to be gathered from additional agencies. Dr. Lytle said typically the Consumnes Sub-basin is considered north of the Mokelumne. Mr. Nakagawa added the decline is on both sides of the Mokelumne.

2. Summary Presentation on Freeport Element Draft Engineering Feasibility Report (See Attached) – Mel Lytle/Mark Williamson

Mr. Williamson presented a brief overview of the Freeport Element. This is an attempt to make use of San Joaquin County's filing on the American River. This

report updates The Freeport Element Draft Report completed in August 2009 which was updated to determine water availability, develop alternatives, engineering information adequate for cost comparisons, environmental comparisons, and an environmental assessment. The Freeport Project was operational as of January 2, 2011. The San Joaquin County water right application was cancelled by the State Board as of October 2010. The county filed a writ of mandate last month. The ICU PEIR was adopted last month, as well, and the Freeport Element is included.

A Freeport Project would make use of San Joaquin County's Water Right Application 29657 (assumes reversal of cancellation by State Board) and makes use of the Freeport Regional Water Authority (FRWA) Freeport Pipeline. There is a South Fork point of diversion through the Folsom South Canal Connection Pipeline. From Rancho Seco into Stockton, the canal was never finished. The county's water right application was amended to a Freeport diversion point.

The water right application is for up to 350 cfs, with storage of 147,000 af/yr. The FRWA Freeport Project pipeline has 287 cfs at Freeport and EBMUD is utilizing 155 cfs.

During the analysis a broad overview of places to put the water and methods for utilizing the water were analyzed. Mapping of recharge sites and ag in-lieu suitability were done. Seven alternatives are detailed and a sensitivity analysis looked at sub-alternatives.

Freeport Pipeline Hydraulic Gradeline indicates how high the water would rise if a pipe was placed vertically into it. Assuming 155 cfs delivered to the inflection point (south turning east) there would be 175 feet of surplus head. This is more than what is needed for the alternatives, so the pumping plant would demonstrate energy savings. If 198 cfs is pumped through the same pipeline the yield can be enhanced. To get water to the Duck Creek Reservoir it would not be necessary to operate the Comanche Pumping Station.

Thirty performance measures were studied including things such as reliability and sustainability, economics, compatibility, environmental constraints, and implementability. Different weighting schemes were studied, as well. Through this type of work, patterns and the more favorable projects begin to emerge. All of this information is included in detail within the report.

Capital costs and project yield was graphed to show what a regional agency might pay versus a local agency. Projects serving water treatment plans have dedicated pipelines so the cost is higher. In-lieu distribution has considerable costs as new distribution lines have to be constructed, although some costs would be attributable to MORE Water. In the banking projects, some of the costs are attributable to the banking partners. 15,000 af/yr – 70K af/yr is the range of yield depending on the project.

Unit cost and project yield was graphed as was operational, maintenance, and capital costs. The projects requiring the most pumping have the highest operational costs. What is missing is what would be paid to EBMUD and Sacramento County for use of the pipeline, etc. The total cost is \$922 million with the EBMUD cost at \$481 million. Minimal facilities needed by San Joaquin County would be \$203 million. Cost sharing formulas will reflect frequency of use, volume conveyed, sunk cost/maintenance, and water banking contracts. There are a lot of variables which cause of range of cost between \$0 and \$200 per acf for the water.

Staff suggested members need to discuss each alternative and make one of the following recommendations for each alternative: carry it forward, conduct further studies, or set it aside.

Alt C-1 is Urban In-Lieu Water Treatment Plants (WTP) and includes three WTPs resulting in 17,000 af/yr. It has relatively low yield and staff recommends setting this alternative aside. Lodi and Stockton have expressed minimal interest in this alternative. Additionally, there is a high unit cost and a number of low ratings on the attribute chart.

Alt C-2 is Urban In-lieu w/ Jack tone Pipeline. Staff recommends additional study. In combination with other opportunities, such as a canal alternative instead of a pressure pipeline, it may be viable.

Alt G1a is Ag In-lieu (no storage) Duck Ck. This alternative has seasonal issues and yields 15,000 af/yr. This alternative has a fundamental mismatch between when water is available and when it is needed and has a high unit cost. Staff recommends setting this alternative aside.

Alt G1-b is Ag In-lieu w/ MORE Water Project and 150,000 af/yr Duck Creek Reservoir. Staff recommends additional study for detailed operational information.

Alt G1-c is Ag in-lieu 75,000 af/yr Duck Creek Reservoir. This alternative would yield 43,000 af/yr. It would be filled by only using American River supply. All the water could be put to use in this way and the project is mainly in the Stockton East District. Staff recommends carrying this alternative forward.

Alt G2 is Recharge Ponds, Bear CK/Pixley Slough. It would yield 44,000 af/yr. Recharge ponds are independent of when supply is needed and staff recommends carrying this alternative forward. It is highly reliable with fairly moderate energy costs.

Alt R1 is Regional Project Recharge Ponds plus Injection Wells. It includes Bear CK/Pixley Slough and has shared costs, 12 injection wells, 23 extraction wells and yields 58,000 af/yr. This alternative shares costs with other partners and applies the rules of the county's groundwater export ordinance thereby leaving

extra water in the San Joaquin County Basin. Staff recommends carrying this alternative forward.

The next step in the process is to facilitate GBA/Stakeholder review. Then members need to determine if they wish to select a preferred project. If so, there will need to be a conveyance agreement with EBMUD and San Joaquin County Water Agencies, a project EIR, and designation of early implementation projects.

Director Nomellini asked that the summary of projects be sent to members of the board.

3. Update on Proposition 84 IRWM Planning Grant Application Submittal (See Attached) – Mel Lytle/Brandon Nakagawa

DWR came out with final list of recommended funding for IRWMP planning grants. In the packet is the list of those recommended for funding. The GBA was approved for \$545,925 in funding through Prop 84 funds. The inter-regional project was not recommended for funding. The Mokelumne Forum met last week and one of their current goals is to prepare a revised Prop 84 planning grant application.

Director Herrick asked regarding the regional project why if there were only two inter-regional proposals neither were funded. No one knew the answer and could only speculate. August/September is when the new round should open.

B. Action Items:

1. Discussion and Possible Action to Authorize Submittal of a Prop. 1E Stormwater Flood Management Project Grant Application (See Attached) – Brandon Nakagawa/Mark Williamson

Attached in the packet is the resolution recommended by staff. The recommendation is to participate in the proposal for a stormwater management grant. The projects need to be consistent with an existing IRWMP. The package, due April 15th, will show this is an integrated project. Mr. Nakagawa said the Coordinating Committee has talked extensively about the application. It is the responsibility of the two districts within which the project will be built to develop the application. Director Panizza moved Resolution R-11-3 authorizing submittal of an application to the Integrated Regional water Management Implementation Grant Program and Execution of an Agreement with the California Department of Water Resources. The motion was seconded by Director Ferraro and passed unanimously.

C. Communications (See Attached):

1. Workshop: Integrated Regional Water Management – Working Together for California’s Water Future

Dr. Lytle said the meeting is in May and some regions will be presenting. Staff will inquire if the GBA can present.

2. Lodi New Sentinel – A Solution to Dwindling Groundwater Basin?

See attached.

3. Southwestern Water: Going, Going, Gone?

Dr. Lytle highlighted the following:

Among Southwestern states, California ranks just after Arizona in the percentage of water use supplied by groundwater: In 2005, it was 33 percent for California and 49 percent for Arizona. In both states, irrigated agriculture accounts for the lion's share of all water use.

Dr. Lytle said he does not know how the figures were calculated. He noted there is a full report on the website.

Public Comment (Non-Agenda):

Vice Chair Miller opened the public comment section of the meeting. There were no comments offered by the public.

Adjournment:

The Vice Chair adjourned the meeting at 10:41 a.m.

Next Regular Meeting: April 13, 2011, at 9:30 a.m.

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

Submitted by:

Carolyn Lott, Senior Facilitator/Mediator
Center for Collaborative Policy

**ATTACHMENT
A.1.**

**Proposition 84 Round 1 Implementation Grant
Draft Funding Recommendations**

Funding Area/ Maximum Allocation ^f	IRWM Region	Applicant	Grant Request	Score (out of 85)	Recommended Award
Central Coast \$11,555,556	Santa Barbara Countywide	Santa Barbara County Water Agency	\$3,000,996	60	\$3,000,996
	San Luis Obispo	San Luis Obispo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	\$11,555,556	56	\$10,401,000
	Greater Monterey County	City of Soledad	\$4,868,441	55	\$4,139,000
	Monterey Peninsula, Carmel Bay, South Monterey Bay	Monterey Peninsula Water Management District	\$6,127,286	44	\$0
Total			\$25,552,279		\$17,540,996
Colorado River Basin \$8,000,000	Coachella Valley	Coachella Valley Water District	\$4,000,000	57	\$4,000,000
	Mojave	Mojave Water Agency*	\$8,000,000	53	\$6,000,000
Total			\$12,000,000		\$10,000,000
Lahontan \$6,000,000	Mojave	Mojave Water Agency*	\$2,000,000	53	\$2,000,000
	Antelope Valley	Antelope Valley - East Kern Water Agency	\$6,000,000	48	\$5,400,000
	Tahoe- Sierra	South Tahoe Public Utility District	\$5,744,944	42	\$0
	Inyo-Mono	Central Sierra Resource Conservation and Development, Inc.	\$4,299,858	39	\$0
Total			\$18,044,802		\$7,400,000
Los Angeles - Ventura \$47,777,778	Watersheds Coalition of Ventura County	County of Ventura	\$17,510,599	64	\$17,510,599
	Upper Santa Clara River	Castaic Lake Water Agency	\$7,700,053	57	\$6,931,000
	Greater Los Angeles County	Los Angeles County Flood Control District	\$32,000,000	56	\$25,600,000
Total			\$57,210,652		\$50,041,599
North Coast \$8,222,222	North Coast	County of Humboldt	\$8,221,061	61	\$8,221,061
Total			\$8,221,061		\$8,221,061
Sacramento River \$16,222,222	American River Basin	Regional Water Authority*	\$14,303,766	56	\$14,303,766
	Cosumnes, American, Bear Yuba	City of Nevada City*	\$3,197,503	51	\$3,197,503
Total			\$17,501,269		\$17,501,269
San Diego \$20,222,222	South Orange County Watershed Management Area	County of Orange	\$2,316,780	54	\$2,316,780
	San Diego	San Diego County Water Authority	\$7,900,000	48	\$7,900,000
	Upper Santa Margarita	Rancho California Water District	\$4,332,008	35	\$67,500*
Total			\$14,548,788		\$10,284,280
San Francisco Bay Area \$30,666,667	East Contra Costa County	Contra Costa Water District*	\$1,775,000	52	\$1,775,000
	San Francisco Bay Area	Bay Area Clean Water Agencies	\$29,715,426	49	\$29,715,426
Total			\$31,490,426		\$31,490,426
San Joaquin River \$12,666,667	Madera	Root Creek Water District	\$9,413,947	57	\$9,413,947
	American River Basin	Regional Water Authority*	\$1,918,456	56	\$1,727,000
	Mokelumne/ Amador/ Calaveras	Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority	\$2,703,327	54	\$2,298,000
	East Contra Costa County	Contra Costa Water District*	\$10,885,000	52	\$0
	Cosumnes, American, Bear Yuba	City of Nevada City*	\$712,761	51	\$0
	Eastern San Joaquin	Northeastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Banking Authority	\$1,345,644	48	\$0
	Westside-San Joaquin	San Luis and Delta-Mendota Water Authority*	\$11,451,053	42	\$0
Total			\$38,430,188		\$13,438,947
Santa Ana \$25,333,333	Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority	Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority	\$12,660,004	52	\$12,660,004
Total			\$12,660,004		\$12,660,004
Tulare Lake \$13,333,333	Poso Creek	Semitropic Water Storage District	\$12,892,510	55	\$8,215,000
	Kaweah River Basin	Kaweah Delta Water Conservation District	\$7,286,423	55	\$4,643,000
	Upper Kings Water Forum	Upper Kings Basin IRWM Authority	\$13,333,333	55	\$8,496,000
	Westside-San Joaquin	San Luis and Delta-Mendota Water Authority*	\$992,600	42	\$0
Total			\$34,504,866		\$21,354,000
Grand Total		\$200,000,000	\$270,164,335		\$200,000,082

^f Maximum allocations as documented in Column D, Table 2, of the August 2010, P84 Implementation, Round 1 Proposal Solicitation Package

* Application contains projects in two funding areas

* Fund Joint Project with SDCWA

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 84 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program

Implementation Grant, Round 1, FY 2010-2011

Applicant	Northeastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Banking Authority	Amount Requested	\$ 1,345,644
Proposal Title	City of Stockton Phase II HET Residential Program and Stockton East Water District 35 Acre Recharge and Conjunctive Use Project	Total Proposal Cost	\$ 1,794,379

PROPOSAL SUMMARY

Two projects are included in the proposal: (1) City of Stockton High Efficiency Toilet Direct Installation Phase II Program to Residential Customers (Phase II HET Program) and (2) the Stockton East Water District (SEWD) 35 Acre Recharge Pond and Conjunctive Use Project (Recharge Project).

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Points Possible	Criteria	Score/ Points Possible
Work Plan	12/15	Economic Analysis – Water Supply Costs and Benefits	12/15
Budget	5/5	Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits	3/15
Schedule	5/5	Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction	0/15
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	3/5	Program Preferences	8/10
Total Score (max. possible = 85)			48

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The following is a review summary of the proposal.

Work Plan

The criterion is fully addressed, but is not supported by thorough documentation and sufficient rationale for one of the projects. Project 2 is part of the larger Farmington Groundwater Recharge Program, which is an integral component of the 2007 IRWMP and the Regional Integrated Conjunctive Use Program. For this project, construction descriptions on pages 3-37 and 3-38 are extremely brief and are not sufficiently detailed; and technical information supporting feasibility is lacking credibility. For example, a target recharge rate of 0.4 feet per day may be reasonable, and is stated to be similar to other operational recharge cells located on the applicant's property, but no technical or historical data is included in the attachment or the application that supports the data.

Budget

The costs are reasonable, and all the supporting documentation for the Budget categories is thoroughly supported. A summary budget is provided for both projects, as well as a summary budget for the total proposal that shows a 25% funding match. Each project includes detailed information, though with more detail included for the cost estimate in Project 2, as the scope for this project is much larger. The applicant is only requesting grant funds to purchase toilets and associated plumbing materials for Project 1. The costs appear reasonable and agree with the tasks included in the applicable work plans.

Schedule

The schedule is consistent and reasonable, and demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation by December 1, 2011. The schedule corresponds to the tasks identified in the Work Plan. Project 1 (Task 4) is scheduled to begin in September 2011. For Project 2: 60% Design was completed June 2010; 90% Design is scheduled for completion June 2011; and 100% Design is scheduled for July 2011 with construction schedule to begin in September 2011. Project 1 and 2 are scheduled for completion (Final Reporting) in December 2013 and March 2012, respectively.

Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. The applicant includes a single page with two separate Project Performance Measures Tables, one for each proposed project. The two tables do include information for each of the six elements identified in the Implementation PSP. In addition, other than the brief information contained in the tables, no explanation is provided relating to the project benefits or objectives identified in the proposal. The outcome indicators are not consistent with what was requested in the PSP. For example, the outcome indicators provided of "feet per day" and "acre-feet" are only partially indicative of output indicators requested, and not outcome indicators. As an example, "Improved water quality and/or water supply reliability" could have been included as outcome indicators necessary to satisfy this criterion.

Economic Analysis – Water Supply Costs and Benefits

Above average levels of water supply benefits relative to costs can be realized through this proposal, based on the quality of the analysis and supporting documentation. The proposal includes two projects, both of which provide water supply benefits. Generally, the proposal provides a good analysis and explanation of cost and benefit calculations. Issues noted below include incorrect accounting for land cost.

Project 1 would install HETs or replace high water use toilets in residences, especially targeting pre-1992 homes and economically Disadvantaged Communities (DAC). 400 HETs are targeted for installation in residences, with a projected savings of 22.4 acre-feet (AF) per year. Another 417 would be installed in Commercial, Industrial, and Institutional (CII) locations, with savings of 39.2 AF per year. Savings per HET is calculated using California Urban Water Conservation Council (CUWCC) methodology, resulting in savings of 0.056 AF/yr/HET residential and 0.0941 AF/yr/HET for CII. Savings appear appropriately scaled over the installation period. Value of savings is \$732/AF, the marginal unit cost of municipal supply from a recent project, Delta Water Supply Project. Cost and yield summary are well supported as data are provided and referenced. Based on information provided, the applicant assumed that the HETs would actually avoid the full cost of the other project (including capital) in the near term. Present value (PV) of costs is \$360K, and PV of benefits is \$407K.

Project 2 would construct and operate a 35-acre recharge basin. Water sources include Calaveras and Stanislaus River delivery, treatment plant backwash, and local drainage water. Maximum recharge capacity is 2,680 AF/year. Existing wells would extract water and deliver to Stockton municipal treatment plant. Expected maximum dry-year extraction is 1,193 AF per year. The recharge and extraction quantities appear reasonable but are not well supported. For example it is unclear how the recharged water would have been used in absence of this recharge project. Costs are shown in 2009 \$ and capital cost matches that shown in Table 7.

Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits

Only low levels of water quality and other benefits relative to costs can be realized through this proposal, as demonstrated by the analysis and supporting documentation. Only a general description of possible quality benefits is provided, and the cause and effect link seems weak in the case of the Project 1.

For both projects, a general description is provided drawing an indirect link to reduced arsenic levels in drinking water and reduced salinity intrusion from avoided groundwater pumping. For Project 1, this is not consistent with the description of water supply benefits, because the assumed water supply alternative is not groundwater pumping, but rather the avoided cost of another surface water treatment project.

Project 2 is likely to reduce migration of saline groundwater by some amount, but the degree of significance is unclear given the scale of the project. Also, the project is not sited specifically to address salinity intrusion. It is also unclear how significantly the project would affect arsenic levels region-wide.

Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction

No flood damage reduction benefit is claimed.

Program Preferences

The Proposal includes two projects that collectively will implement multiple Program Preferences. While Project 2 addresses drought preparedness, as a stand-alone project and as a component of a larger project, it does not directly meet a critical water supply or water quality need of a DAC. Although Project 1 has a goal of 15% of the high efficiency toilets slated for installation in the DACs, the applicant did not clearly identify how this addresses a critical water supply or water quality need. Both projects meet numerous other IRWM Program Preferences and Statewide Priorities. Based on the thoroughness of the Work Plan, and in the information provided in Attachment 11, the applicant demonstrates a high-degree of certainty that the applicable Preferences and Priorities will be implemented. The applicant has documented the magnitude and breadth of the following Preferences: Include regional projects or programs, Effectively integrate water management programs and projects within hydrologic region, Effectively resolve significant water-related conflicts within or between regions, Contribute to attainment of one or more of the objectives of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program, Use and reuse water more efficiently, Protect surface water and groundwater quality, and Drought preparedness.

**ATTACHMENT
B.1.**

DRAFT

**AGREEMENT TO EXTEND THE TERM OF THE NORTHEASTERN SAN JOAQUIN
COUNTY GROUNDWATER BANKING AUTHORITY
JOINT EXERCISE OF POWERS AGREEMENT
(GBA AGREEMENT A-11-01)**

This Amendment ("Amendment") is made pursuant to section 8.01 of the Northeastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Banking Authority Joint Exercise of Power Agreement as of by and between the San Joaquin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District ("County District"); the City of Stockton ("Stockton"); the City of Lodi ("Lodi"); Stockton East Water District ("SEWD"); Central San Joaquin Water Conservation District ("Central"); Woodbridge Irrigation District ("Woodbridge"); North San Joaquin Water Conservation District ("NSJWCD"); Central Delta Water Agency ("Central Delta"); South Delta Water Agency ("South Delta"); and California Water Service Company ("Cal Water")

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual obligations in this Amendment, the parties agree as follows:

1. ARTICLE VII, section 7.01 Term, of the original agreement is modified in its entirety as follows:

Section 7.01. Term. The Members hereby agree to extend the Joint Powers Agreement, establishing the Northeastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Banking Authority, which terminates on June 30, 2011, to December 31, 2011.

2. All provisions of the original agreement, except as modified by this Amendment, shall remain in full force and effect and are reaffirmed. In the event of any conflict, inconsistency, or incongruity between any provisions of this Amendment and any provision of the original agreement, the provision of this Amendment shall govern and control.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this Amendment and Extension Agreement to be executed on the day and year set opposite the name of the parties.

**ATTACHMENT
B.3.**

DRAFT

Before the Board of Directors

Northeastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Banking Authority
A Joint Powers Agency, State of California

B-11-1

MOTION:

APPROVE AMENDMENT NO. 3 TO THE GEI/BOOKMAN-EDMONSTON
CONSULTANT AGREEMENT FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

THIS BOARD OF DIRECTORS hereby approves Amendment No. 3 to the GEI/Bookman-Edmonston Consultant Agreement for professional services to extend the term from July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the above order was passed and adopted on June 8, 2011 by the following vote of the Board of Directors, to wit:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

THOMAS M. GAU
Secretary of the Board of Directors
A Joint Powers Agency
State of California

**ATTACHMENT
B.4.**

DRAFT

Before the Board of Directors

Northeastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Banking Authority
A Joint Powers Agency, State of California

B-11- 2

MOTION:

APPROVE AMENDMENT NO. 4 WITH SACRAMENTO STATE CENTER FOR COLLABORATIVE POLICY FOR FACILITATION SERVICES FOR THE NORTHEASTERN SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY GROUNDWATER BANKING AUTHORITY

THIS BOARD OF DIRECTORS hereby approves Amendment No. 4 with the Sacramento State of Collaborative Policy for professional services to extend the term from July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the above order was passed and adopted on June 8, 2011 by the following vote of the Board of Directors, to wit:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

THOMAS M. GAU
Secretary of the Board of Directors
A Joint Powers Agency
State of California

**ATTACHMENT
B.5.**

Eastern San Joaquin Integrated Regional Water Management Plan Update

For information, contact Brandon Nakagawa, P.E. or Mel Lytle, Ph.D. at (209) 468-3089, or via email at bnakagawa@sigov.org or mlytle@sigov.org, respectively.

Project Description:

The Northeastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Banking Authority (GBA) seeks consultant services to update its Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWM Plan) adopted in 2007. The GBA has received a Proposition 84 IRWM Planning Grant from the Department of Water Resources in the amount of \$545,925 to partially fund the IRWMP Update.

Desired Qualifications and Experiences:

- Successful development of IRWM Plans;
- Mastery of new DWR IRWM Plan requirements;
- Understanding water-related challenges of Eastern San Joaquin County regarding:
 - Groundwater overdraft;
 - Conjunctive Water Management;
 - Climate Adaptability;
 - Flood Protection;
 - Land Use;
 - Delta Issues;
 - Water Rights;
 - Disadvantaged Communities; and
 - Financial Abilities.
- Ability to project water supply available on the American, Mokelumne, Calaveras, and Stanislaus Rivers.

Projected Date of RFP release: July 2011.

The Request for Proposals (RFP) will specify requirements for the documents to be submitted and describe the selection process. Prior to the release, interested firms may request additional information about the project as indicated above. Following the release of the RFP, inquiries will be referred to members of Department of Public Works staff, who administer the selection process.

**ATTACHMENT
C.1.**



Fact Sheet

The Association of California Water Agencies (ACWA) has released a new policy document aimed at advancing sustainable groundwater management in California. The document, "Sustainability from the Ground Up: A Framework for Groundwater Management in California," provides an in-depth look at current groundwater management efforts in California and recommends proactive steps to advance sustainable management around the state.

Developed over 18 months by a task force representing local public water agencies and groundwater managers around the state, the Framework was approved unanimously by ACWA's statewide Board of Directors. It highlights examples of successful local groundwater management programs, identifies impediments to success at the local level, and recommends actions and policies to help ensure the sustainability of groundwater resources.

The recommendations reflect the on-the-ground experience of experts involved in managing groundwater in a variety of geographic and hydrologic settings. ACWA believes implementing these actions will help address obstacles to success and empower local agencies to strengthen their groundwater management efforts.

Key Messages of the Framework

- California has a long history of managing groundwater resources through locally controlled programs. The array of challenges on the horizon, however, will demand even more of local agencies and require a greater commitment to sustainable groundwater management.
- As surface water deliveries continue to be constrained due to a variety of factors, California is relying more and more on groundwater to meet needs. The shift to greater reliance makes effective management a critical challenge as the state works to implement historic legislation enacted in 2009 to improve water supply reliability and ecosystem health.
- ACWA believes that challenge can only be met by local and regional agencies. This Framework was developed to elevate the importance of that task and make a strong statement in support of sustainable groundwater management, defined as actively

managing groundwater to meet environmental and economic objectives while protecting the long-term health of the basin.

- The Framework calls on local water agencies to implement groundwater management plans and strategies to meet sustainability objectives. The plans should be developed in a transparent manner with public input, and information about plans and local groundwater conditions should be readily available to the state Department of Water Resources.
- While there are numerous examples of successful local management, there is much work to be done to address impediments and achieve sustainable outcomes throughout the state.
- Locally controlled groundwater management is effective because it is best able to respond to the particular circumstances of – and significant differences in – each groundwater basin. Local expertise and direct reliance on the resource ensures immediate response to problems and provides the strongest basis for collaborative regional approaches.
- Groundwater management plans developed under AB 3030, SB 1938 and the Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Act offer prime opportunities to improve management and address the potential consequences of a large-scale shift to groundwater, whether cyclical or permanent.
- ACWA believes the one-size-fits-all approach of statewide groundwater regulation would be counterproductive given the significant differences in groundwater basins. But that is not to say there is no role for the state. ACWA believes the state should encourage and facilitate local management by improving online access to data, by working collaboratively with local agencies to remove impediments wherever possible, and by incentivizing the expansion of sustainable practices.
- Ultimately, for sustainable groundwater management to succeed, California must also invest in conveyance improvements in the Delta, additional surface storage and groundwater storage to optimize both water supply reliability and ecosystem health, and local water resources development.
- Local water agencies are willing to raise the bar and do their part to meet the state's overall need for sustainable groundwater management.