



# GBA Coordinating Committee Meeting

September 14, 2011 10:30 a.m.

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

## ----- Agenda Topics -----

- A. Discussion on Draft MOU Between Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority and GBA on IRWMP Update and Planning Grant Application Activities (See Attached) – Mel Lytle/Brandon Nakagawa
- B. Update on IRWMP RFP and Schedule – Brandon Nakagawa
- C. Updates on Groundwater Recharge and Banking Efforts – All Agencies
  - North San Joaquin – Tracy Lakes Project
  - SEWD
    - AB 303 Monitoring Well
    - 35 acre site
    - Bozzano Property

### Future Agenda Items:

- Groundwater Basin Recharge and Banking Operations

**The next regularly scheduled GBA Coordinating Committee meeting is  
October 12, 2011, 10:30 a.m.**

Agendas and Minutes may also be found on the GBA Website at:  
<http://www.gbawater.org>

Note: If you need disability-related modification or accommodation in order to participate in this meeting, please contact the Water Resource Staff at (209) 468-3531 at least 48 hours prior to the start of the meeting.

**Northern San Joaquin Groundwater Banking Authority  
Coordinating Committee Meeting Summary  
Wednesday, August 10, 2011**

**Follow up Items:**

None

**A. Discussion on Coordination Between the Mokelumne River Forum, Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority and GBA on IRWMP Update and Planning Grant Application Activities – Mel Lytle/Brandon Nakagawa/Mark Williamson:**

There was considerable discussion at the last Mokelumne Forum meeting. Mr. Kevin Kauffman indicated the tone was somewhat melancholy as they have to date not made much progress. Water agencies want to describe a project and involve environmental agencies in the project elements.

Mr. Ed Pattison shared that the Foothill Conservancy has influenced the focus of the board over the last few years. The Conservancy is interested in urban recycling, conservation, etc. The Forum has focused on providing educational information regarding agency activities. This seemed to be successful. Now the Conservancy wants to focus on how water is used by agriculture. Providing additional educational opportunities is seen by some as a lack of progress in getting on with formulating projects.

Dr. Lytle voiced his opinion that whatever is done needs to be an inclusive program including things such as flood and stormwater management, not solely supply. He added the GBA and UMRWA want to move ahead with applying for a planning grant. However, the grant needs to be prepared by a consultant and include a part-time Executive Director as part of the grant request. Paying for this could be split 50/50 between GBA and UMRWA.

Mr. Kevin Kauffman said the planning grant should develop alternatives which combine engineered solutions with soft solutions.

Mr. Dante Nomellini commented much has already been developed through the GBA's IRWM. He also objected to the cost being split 50/50 as he believes EBMUD should provide a full share, not part of UMRWA's share.

Mr. Jason Preece noted dollars spent to date on previous planning has brought opportunities such as being eligible to apply for additional grants.

Dr. Lytle said who pays what share has not been decided, but that he wanted the group's input. He believes it will take \$20,000-\$30,000 to pay a consultant to develop the planning grant application. He said there are other issues under discussion such as who submits the application, how the consultant is paid, etc. They will work this out during meetings of a planning team and then come back to the GBA with a recommendation.

**B. Discussion of Upcoming California Water Commission Water Storage Conference 1 & 2 – Mel Lytle**

Dr. Lytle offered the idea of getting the IRCUP effort on the agenda to provide something that is Forum focused. Mr. Anthony Barkett offered to look into this opportunity and see if they could be part of the program.

**C. Updates on groundwater Recharge and Banking Efforts – All Agencies**

**1. North San Joaquin WaterSMART Grant-Tracy Lakes Project**

Mr. Hugh Scanlon said the attorneys are meeting to advise on forming a district within the NSJWCD. This would be a district of property owners. They estimate they should receive the grant next month.

Eight acre feet can be used by local farmers or used for recharge. The local cost share would be borne by the newly formed district.

**2. Northside Recharge Project**

Mr. Kauffman said they are working with the Stockton Area Water Suppliers (SAWS) group to come up with \$15 million through a borrowing plan. This would enable them to refinance their current debt, purchase 230 acres of land and develop a recharge project. It still needs to go to the board for a vote.

**3. Phase 1 Freeport**

Dr. Lytle said the Board of Supervisors accepted the Phase 1 Freeport Plan. Staff is working on Phase 2 which is a detailed analysis of the water basin and updated modeling. The technical report will be part of the detailed environmental work.

Mr. Nakagawa added they need a model that can be asked more sophisticated questions so they can adequately respond to CEQA. They are looking at a more public domain model versus the current proprietary model. During the next few months they will develop criteria and a scope of work. They will come back for approval to move forward with the effort. He noted the majority of dollars are spent in building the base of a model.

Mr. Dante Nomellini stated he did not understand why they need yet another model.

Mr. Stan Ferraro said members need a better understanding of what is needed and why it is needed.

**Future Agenda Items:**

- Groundwater Basin Recharge and Banking Operations
- Freeport Phase 2 Proposal
- Forum Planning Grant Proposal

**Next Regularly Scheduled Meeting:** September 14, 2011 10:30 a.m.

**Submitted by:**

Carolyn Lott, Facilitator  
Center for Collaborative Policy



**ATTACHMENT  
A.**

**DRAFT**

**MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING**

**For the Preparation of a Proposition 84 Planning Grant Application to Define and Investigate an Inter-Regional Conjunctive Use Concept**

This Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is entered into this \_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_, 2011 by and among the Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority (UMRWA) and the Northeastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Banking Authority (GBA). UMRWA and GBA are referred to collectively as the "Parties".

**RECITALS**

WHEREAS, the UMRWA is a joint powers authority comprised of agencies with water supply and water resource management authorities and responsibilities in Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, Alameda and Contra Costa Counties, and

WHEREAS, the GBA is a joint powers authority established in 2001 and comprised of agencies with water supply and water resource management authorities and responsibilities within San Joaquin County, and

WHEREAS, water resources originating from the Mokelumne River watershed have been and will remain a significant source of the water for people, the environment, and agribusiness and provide an invaluable contribution to the economy and public well-being, and

WHEREAS, the Parties recognize the potential for improved groundwater management and conjunctive management of ground and surface water resources, and are interested in mutually exploring the potential for increased availability of water supplies through the development of an inter-regional conjunctive use concept, and

WHEREAS, this concept may utilize new and expanded water storage, groundwater banking, water exchanges, water transfers, conservation, recycling, improved urban and agricultural efficiencies together with other watershed and habitat improvements as part of an overall natural resources strategy for the Mokelumne River watershed to provide additional water supply sustainability and reliability benefits to the Parties, their member agencies and the environment, and

WHEREAS, the Parties, through the Mokelumne River Forum, have determined to proceed collaboratively to investigate the potential benefits of this inter-regional concept, and

WHEREAS, the Parties have determined that this MOU between UMRWA and the GBA which defines the Parties respective roles and responsibilities in preparing a Proposition 84 Planning Grant application is appropriate and desired.

**NOW, THEREFORE,** the Parties recognize that this MOU is a statement of agreement to participate in the preparation and cost-sharing of a Proposition 84 Planning Grant application to be submitted in the next round of Planning Grants offered by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR). The Parties further acknowledge that time is of the essence.

The Parties agree to the following:

#### **1.0 ADMINISTRATING AGENCY**

1.1 UMRWA shall, for the purposes of preparing an inter-regional Proposition 84 Planning Grant application, serve as the Administrating Agency. As Administrating Agency UMRWA shall be responsible for the following;

- a) Entering into a contract with a qualified Consultant to prepare the Proposition 84 Planning Grant proposal.
- b) Day-to-day administration of Consultant contract.
- c) Submitting the Proposition 84 Planning Grant proposal to DWR.
- d) Accepting and separately accounting for awarded funds.

#### **2.0 APPLICATION REVIEW COMMITTEE**

2.1 An Application Review Committee, working through the Mokelumne River Forum, shall be established and shall be comprised of up to three GBA representatives, up to three UMRWA representatives, and others as determined by the Mokelumne River Forum. The Application Review Committee shall be responsible for;

- a) Developing the Grant Application Scope of Work which describes the mutually agreed upon work to be funded by a Proposition 84 Planning Grant.
- b) Deciding whether UMRWA, the GBA or another mutually acceptable agency shall be designated in the Application to receive any awarded Inter-regional Planning Grant funds.
- c) Reviewing and providing timely comments on the draft Application prepared by Consultant.
- d) Making all Application-related decisions by unanimous consent.

#### **3.0 APPLICATION FUNDING AND COST SHARING**

2.1 UMRWA and the GBA shall each be responsible for 50% of the Consultant costs needed to prepare the Proposition 84 Planning Grant application. Consultant cost shall not exceed \$30,000 unless otherwise mutually agreed by the Parties.

- 2.2 UMRWA and the GBA shall each contribute up to \$3,000 to compensate UMRWA staff for managing the Consultant contract and coordinating input on the draft application by the Parties.
- 2.3 UMRWA shall invoice GBA for its agreed-upon cost share and GBA will remit payment within 30 days of receipt of invoice.
- 2.4 Each Party shall be solely responsible for paying costs it incurs in fulfilling its responsibilities as described herein.

4.0 MOKELUMNE RIVER FORUM RESPONSIBILITIES

- 4.1 The role of the Mokelumne River Forum during the preparation of the Proposition 84 Planning Grant application will be:
  - a) Facilitate the Application Review Committee's development of the Grant Proposal Scope of Work which describes the mutually agreed upon work to be funded by a Proposition 84 Planning Grant.
  - b) With respect to 4.1a, facilitate resolution of any conflicts internal to the Parties that may arise.

**IN WITNESS WHEREOF**, the undersigned Party has caused this Agreement to be executed as of the day and year set forth above.

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

**UPPER MOKELUMNE RIVER  
WATERSHED AUTHORITY**

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

**NORTHEASTERN SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY  
GROUNDWATER BANKING AUTHORITY**